DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 499 FL 000 856

By- Diekhoff, John S.

NDEA AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES.

Modern Language Association of America, New York, N.Y.

Spons Agency- Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.

Pub Date Aug 65

Note- 155p.

Available from- Materials Center, Modern Language Association, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10011 ($1.50 each, 20% discount on orders of 20 or more copies).

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$6.28

Descriptors- *FEDERAL AID, *FEDERAL PROGRAMS, FELLOWSHIPS, INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), *INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT, LANGUAGE AND AREA CENTERS, *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, LANGUAGE RESEARCH, *MODERN LANGUAGES, PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, STATE PROGRAMS, TEACHER EDUCATION

Identifiers- MLA Foreign Language Program, NDEA

The influence of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) on language education is considered in this study. Special emphasis is given to continuing issues and questions, research in language and language education, fellowships, NDEA language and area centers, institutes and teacher education. There is a chapter on state services, equipment, and materials for improvement of instruction and one on relations between the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association and NDEA. Appendixes include summaries of NDEA achievements, recommendations for future discussion and action, and a list of NDEA titles.(AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED021499

NDEA
and Modern Foreign Languages

John S. Dickhoff

Modern Language Association of America

NDEA and Modern Foreign Languages

NDEA
and Modern Foreign Languages

John S. Diekhoff

Professor of English and Associate Dean
Faculty of Arts and Sciences
Western Reserve University

Modern Language Association of America
4 Washington Place, New York, N. Y. 10003

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Modern Language
Association of America
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright © 1965
By the Modern Language Association of America

Published in August 1965
10,000 copies

Copies of this Book may be obtained from:
Materials Center
Modern Language Association
4 Washington Place
New York, N.Y. 10003
Price: $1.50 each. 20% discount on orders of 20 or more copies.

Table of Contents

Foreword	ix	
Preface	xiii	
Chapter I	1	Before and After
Chapter II	11	Continuing Issues and Open Questions
Chapter III	35	Research in Languages and Language Education
Chapter IV	51	Fellowships for Modern Foreign Language Scholars
Chapter V	69	NDEA Language and Area Centers
Chapter VI	83	Institutes and Teacher Education
Chapter VII	101	State Services, Equipment, and Materials for Improvement of Instruction
Chapter VIII	119	MLA FLP & NDEA
Appendices:	133	*Titles of the National Defense Education Act*
	135	*How This Study Was Written*
	139	*Summary of NDEA Achievements*
	143	*Summary of Recommendations*

Foreword

The development of certain aspects of the NDEA Language Development Program from the pre-1958 MLA Foreign Language Program is familiar history. What is less familiar, or at least less discussed, is the impact that the large-scale expenditure of Federal dollars over the last half-dozen years has had upon language learning and language teaching in the United States. Those in charge have been very good about evaluating the NDEA Language Development Program—institutes in particular—but it is almost too much to ask any agency to spend its own funds to inquire deeply into its *raison d'être*. Nevertheless NDEA Language Development has been more self-critical than the MLA itself in recent years. While many scholars and teachers welcomed the opportunities to improve language teaching provided by NDEA, a disappointingly large number were not interested and have left the task to others. Neither group has been inclined to study objectively the progress that has been made since 1958.

The real achievement of the Foreign Language Program from 1952 to 1958 was that it created a ferment out of which came some new ideas that the NDEA Language Development Program formalized and distributed in usable packages. The trouble was that by 1963 the ferment had nearly ceased and the packages—many of them originally conceived as tentative and temporary—were in a fair way of becoming standard brands. This situation was underscored in an address delivered at Middlebury College in August 1963 by Kenneth W. Mildenberger, Director of the USOE Division of College and University Assistance (under which the NDEA Language Development Program falls). He spoke of the "immense stillness" that had fallen over the private sector after 1958: the feeling that the passage of NDEA had solved all problems and that leadership had passed by default into the unwilling hands of USOE officials who administered the Federal funds. Reacting to this criticism, the Advisory Committee of the Foreign Language

Program in November of 1963 addressed itself to the problem of how to reawaken the ferment of the 1950's so as to again produce meaningful interaction among the various groups inside and outside of the foreign language profession. A first step, clearly, was to look closely at the effect of NDEA. This was not easy. The MLA had been so closely connected with NDEA Language Development from the beginning—the first two Chiefs had been former Directors of the Foreign Language Program; many of the NDEA Language Development staff were active and loyal MLA members, and MLA FL Program activity since 1958 had consisted so largely of research and conferences financed by NDEA—that it had become unthinkable that MLA and NDEA could have different policies or opinions concerning language teaching in the United States.

It was therefore decided that funds should be sought from an independent source for a study of the impact of NDEA upon the language profession, with the understanding that this meant in some measure studying the relations between NDEA and MLA. The Carnegie Corporation was approached because of its known interest in the sort of philosophical and political problems posed by the study. Mr. John Gardner and Mr. Frederick Jackson saw the point at once. Their only fear was that if the person who made the study had himself been too close to the inner workings of the FL Program and NDEA he would find it impossible to disentangle the threads and emerge with a reasonably objective assessment. They were very happy when the FL Program Advisory Committee settled on Professor John S. Diekhoff as the investigator. Professor Diekhoff, as Milton scholar and Professor of English between 1928 and 1950 at the University of Michigan, Oberlin College, and Queens College, was a respected and knowledgeable member of the profession; as Director of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Professor of Education at Hunter College, and Dean of Cleveland College of Western Reserve University between 1950 and 1963, he had seen the FL Program and NDEA from the vantage point of administrator and educational philosopher; as staff supervisor of the ASTP Language Program in the Pentagon during his war service, he knew as much as anyone on the outside was likely to about the problems of Federal tradition and the language profession. As Professor of Higher Education in the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan, 1963-1965, he was an expert consultant on educational affairs.

In the spring of 1964, the Carnegie Corporation made a grant and John Diekhoff arranged his life so that he could devote full time from 1 July until 31 December to gathering material and writing the report. Monthly meetings with the FL Program Advisory Committee and consultants were arranged to begin in September. A research assistant, John Adams, spent the summer going through voluminous reports and evaluations in the MLA and USOE offices. The autumn's activity turned out to be a fascinating study in both research method and social dynamics. The Diekhoff study was conceived along lines different from the Conant studies of the public schools. Dr. Conant had assembled a staff and made site visits in nearly every state. Professor Diekhoff was asked (and money and time were provided) to make a report based only upon the paper record of NDEA already assembled, supplemented by consultation with USOE and MLA officials and representative members of the profession who were brought as consultants to the New York meetings. The advantage of this procedure was that he received more information from these informed sources than he could have gathered by several years of site visits. The disadvantage was that he had to be constantly aware of the conclusions and convictions that these committed experts had drawn from their own experience.

The result is the following report—in my view a study of historic importance. It is certainly as thoughtful an assessment as has yet been made of the impact of the first years of NDEA. Its judgments and recommendations have already influenced both the MLA and the USOE, and they will provide guidelines for future action. In addition, since Mr. Diekhoff is a student of American education in the broader sense, this report is a case study of the interaction between Federal support and a subject matter discipline. That may be its greatest importance. When the balance of tradition is upset, unexpected things happen. Some of these results are studied in the report.

It is my pleasure, finally, to thank John Diekhoff for being willing to help us, to thank the Carnegie Corporation for financing the study, and to compliment Donald D. Walsh, Director of the Foreign Language Program, his secretary, Mrs. Jean Martin, the members of the FL Program Advisory Committee, and all of the consultants listed in the second appendix for service far beyond the call of duty. Some of them have expressed disappointment at the tone of the report, feeling that it does not do justice to the enormous advances in foreign language teaching made possible by NDEA. But it seems to me that no careful reader of the present text can feel that progress under NDEA is minimized. If the tone is not millennial it is because the millennium has not yet arrived. Debate must continue, along with experimentation and implementation. And we must have many evaluations along the way to incite us both to action and to reaction.

John H. Fisher
Executive Secretary
Modern Language Association

Preface

During the progress of this study, the National Defense Education Act has been extended, with significant changes and additions. A five-year report on the Language and Area Centers, a significant article on the Institute Program, an important study of language laboratories and their uses are among the things published during the preparation of this report. There have been many other descriptions and evaluations of language-teaching activities and programs. The language-teaching profession has had its usual conferences and the stream of professional and popular articles dealing with language education has continued to flow.

Changes in the law, changes in the administration of the NDEA, and the new publications have required revisions of the report while it was in progress. No doubt there will be other significant changes in language education, and new legislation, before this report is published. There will be changes in the administration of NDEA. For example, it has been gratifying to see a number of the recommendations of the report already implemented, surely partly as a result of the many conversations that have been carried on with representatives of the United States Office of Education as part of the writing of it. An evaluation of NDEA Centers is projected, there have been changes in the administrative policies governing the Fellowship program, there are new plans for the encouragement of the study of uncommon languages in undergraduate colleges, and so on. The Modern Language Association also has heeded some of the recommendations for which its Foreign Language Program Advisory Committee shares responsibility, including recommendations for the rejuvenation of that committee. More changes will take place. It is the fate of contemporary history to be out of date when it is published.

In the hope that this piece of contemporary history will nevertheless be useful, it is oriented toward the future rather than to the past or the present. The history of language education as influenced by NDEA and the description of present policies and practices are for the sake of still further progress. Neither the Congress, the United States Office of Education, the Modern Language Association, nor the language teaching profession generally would be content with a mere recital of achievements or failures. The significant question is "What next?"

Since the report is conceived in this way, it is studded with recommendations, some of them for quite specific action. They are addressed to the Office of Education, to the Modern Language Association, to the modern language teaching profession, to the Congress, and to the interested public. Almost every recommendation might be preceded by "it seems to me," or "on balance, it seems to me," and often by "it seems to me, although I am not sure . . ."; but they are presented without these apologies. The object has been to make recommendations that will lead to action through discussion—but first to discussion. With this end in view, I have chosen to make positive and specific recommendations rather than merely to indicate topics which should be discussed.

All of the recommendations have been discussed in committee. Surely they should be further debated, not in the expectation that they will be approved but in the hope that they will be improved. We should not be content with debate and no action. Neither should we be content with insufficiently considered action, of which under emergency pressure we have had perhaps too much.

Acknowledgments

This study was made possible by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York to the Modern Language Association of America.

The occasion for the report and the procedures by which it was prepared are described in Appendix 2, "How This Study Was Written," and many of the people who have contributed to it are listed there. But there must be special mention of some. William R. Parker founded the MLA Foreign Language Program when he was Executive Secretary of the MLA, and he was the first Chief of the Language Development Program in the United States Office of Education. No one knows more about it. He has written about language education, he has talked about it, he has done something about it. He attended every committee meeting during the preparation of the report and was generous with his time in and out of committee. John H. Fisher, present Executive Secretary of the Modern Language Association, and Donald D. Walsh, Director of the Foreign Language Program, have also been especially helpful. They are especially knowledgeable. But all the members of the Advisory Committee and all the consultants listed in Appendix 2 have contributed a great deal. Casey Stengel once observed that he couldn't have done it without the players.

The University of Michigan gave me six months leave of absence to undertake the study when I had been only a year in residence as a member of the Center for the Study of Higher Education. Professor Algo Henderson, Director of the Center, and Dean Willard Olson of the School of Education saw the importance of the task and made the adjustments necessary to make my leave possible. Professor William Jellema assumed responsibility for one of my courses in addition to his other duties in the Center.

My wife, Vera J. Diekhoff, is a patient listener and a careful editor. She has heard it all and has read every word except these. For thirty-five years I have waited to write a book worthy of dedi-

cation to her. Of course I shall never write a book that deserves that. Because we once studied French together, by the grammarless translation method, there is something appropriate about dedicating this little book to her.

J.S.D.
25 March 1965

I

Before and After

Largely as a result of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, more people in the United States are studying modern foreign languages than ever before. They study them longer and they study more different languages. New instructional methods, new content, and new materials for the study of languages have been introduced. Teachers are more numerous and more competent.

The decision of Congress to include modern foreign languages, with science and mathematics, as an area for special support under NDEA was a considered decision, with a history.

The sudden needs of the armed forces during World War II stimulated the study of modern foreign languages and publicized it, but the full stimulus did not carry over into peacetime education. Although World War II was not followed by a wave of isolationism comparable to that which followed World War I,[1] there was nevertheless some such reaction. Language instruction declined during the first years after the war and was at a low ebb during the late forties. A good many educators remained skeptical of the value of high school language instruction, especially for students not bound for college, and among college faculties and administrations there was skepticism concerning the value of language study unless it was pursued intensively and at length. It was widely assumed that two years was all the time that could be allotted to the study of a language and widely agreed that two years were not enough. Elementary school programs were few, enrollments in public high school programs were declining, and many high schools were discontinuing or curtailing their language programs. Many colleges and universities dropped foreign languages from their entrance requirements and some from their graduation requirements. Their language departments could expect few entering freshmen with much language competence, had fewer majors and fewer graduate students each year, and looked forward dismally to a dismal future. Throughout the educational system the percentage of students studying foreign languages declined until 1953.[2]

---

[1] By 1923, twenty-two states had passed laws restricting instruction in foreign languages, or the use of foreign languages as a medium of instruction—a trend stopped by a Supreme Court decision (Meyer vs. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390, 1923). The Supreme Court decision did not make foreign language study popular, however.

By 1952, although the trend had not been reversed in the schools and colleges, there had been changes in the climate of opinion. A number of prominent people had deplored the inability of Americans to manage any language but their own; a number of organizations had urged more stress on language in our school programs; a great many arguments, perhaps some of them specious, had been advanced in favor of foreign language study. There was an important turning point when the Modern Language Association received the first of two grants from the Rockefeller Foundation to study the position and future of modern foreign languages in American schools and colleges, their importance to the national interest, and the part they should play in American life. This was the beginning of the MLA Foreign Language Program.

The purposes of the MLA FL Program (founded by William Riley Parker and later headed by Kenneth W. Mildenberger, both later to head the NDEA Language Development Program), were to encourage the study of foreign languages throughout the American school system—in elementary schools, in secondary schools, in colleges and universities—and to improve its quality. A great deal of the energy and time of the MLA FL Program staff went into fact-finding about the state of language instruction, into the promotion of language teaching, and into the unification of a divided profession.

It is easy to illustrate the changing climate of opinion. In May 1952 Earl J. McGrath, then United States Commissioner of Education, spoke in favor of foreign languages in a widely quoted statement:

[2] William Riley Parker, *The National Interest and Foreign Languages*, 3rd ed., Dept. of State Pub. No. 7324 (Washington, D. C., 1962), pp. 84-90. This is an important book to which I make frequent reference. Parker, Distinguished Service Professor of English at Indiana University, has been Executive Secretary of the Modern Language Association, Director of its Foreign Language Program (1952-56), and was the first chief of the NDEA Language Development Program in the United States Office of Education.

> For some years I unwisely took the position that a foreign language did not constitute an indispensable element in a general education program. This position, I am happy to say, I have reversed. I have now seen the light and I consider foreign languages a very important element in general education. . . . Only through the ability to use another language even modestly can one become conscious of the full meaning of being a member of another nationality or cultural group. . . . It is in our national interest to give as many citizens as possible the opportunity to gain these cultural insights.[3]

The official organ of the National PTA published articles on language education in October 1952, in April 1953, in May 1953, in April 1956, in June 1956, and has done so frequently since, especially since 1960. In the spring of 1953, Commissioner McGrath called a national conference on foreign languages in American education to explore ways of introducing foreign languages into the elementary school. The conference was attended by 350 educators from all over the nation. The inclusion of foreign language instruction in elementary schools was becoming a matter of community pride and community prestige, as the introduction of exotic languages into secondary school programs is now becoming a school status symbol.[4] Colleges that had discontinued language requirements for entrance or for graduation began to reinstate them. The first foreign language specialist on the staff of the USOE, Marjorie C. Johnston, was appointed in 1956.

Since the initiation of the FL Program in 1952, the Executive Council of the MLA and the Advisory and Liaison Committee of the FL Program have issued a series of policy statements that have provided guidance for the foreign language teaching profession. They had marked influence on NDEA provisions for support of language education.[5] Their memorandum of 1957, requesting foundation support for "A Five Year Program for Improving Modern Language Instruction in the National Interest,"[6] is in effect a partial draft of later NDEA provisions for support of modern foreign language education. Groundwork laid by the FL Program of the MLA, by the Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies,[7] and by foundation support of a variety of learned society and university programs prior to 1958 had an important bearing on the inclusion of modern foreign languages as one of three curriculum areas eligible for special support under NDEA, and on the kinds of programs to be supported.[8] In short, the basic outlines for NDEA support of language education had been drafted long before 1957.

---

[3] Quoted by Parker, p. 93. McGrath had made a similar statement in 1950, in an address on "The General Education Movement in America."

[4] Russian, Portuguese, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, and Swahili have been high school subjects in some communities.

[5] "FL Program Policy," *PMLA*, LXXI (Sept. 1956, Pt. 2), xiii-xxiv.

[6] Discussed in detail in Ch. viii, below.

[7] This program is concerned especially with "uncommonly taught" languages, "neglected" languages, and "critical" languages. It pioneered work

Then came Sputnik, on 4 October 1957. *The Ugly American* was a 1958 best seller. Rockefeller Foundation support of the MLA FL Program ended on 31 August 1958. On 2 September 1958 President Eisenhower signed the National Defense Education Act.

Since then, developments in language education have accelerated. Instead of a single Specialist in Foreign Languages in a position established in 1956, the USOE, although still understaffed, now has a large and elaborate Language Development Program[9] with a staff that includes at least a dozen specialists in foreign languages. Two states and the District of Columbia had language supervisors in their state offices of education in 1958; thirty-eight have them now. More and more educators formerly dubious of the value of foreign language instruction except for an intellectual elite have followed McGrath's example and eaten their English words. New texts and materials have poured from the presses, new machines from the factories.

Skepticism about the value of brief or episodic language study is still widespread. Conant, for example, strongly favors language study, but he also observes that if a student is to study a foreign language for only two years, "he might as well play basketball." In the 1940's the expression of this view by a person of Conant's authority and prestige might have resulted in discontinuance or curtailment of language instruction for lack of time or funds. A more common response today is to recommend not that language study be omitted or curtailed but that more time be given to it—although perhaps not at the expense of basketball.

In short, an educational trend that began in the early 1940's

---

in such languages before and during World War II and has remained an important influence. See Ch. v.

[8] Lawrence G. Derthick, "The Purpose and Legislative History of the Foreign Language Titles in the National Defense Education Act, 1958," *PMLA*, LXXIV (May 1959), 48-51. Derthick was United States Commissioner of Education when the Act was passed.

[9] Disbanded, alas, in June 1965.

was interrupted, but was resumed in 1952, advanced steadily under the professional leadership provided by the MLA, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the several associations of teachers of foreign languages. It became an educational revolution when the success of that leadership culminated in the inclusion of language education as an area to be supported by NDEA funds.[10]

The rest had happened with and largely as a result of NDEA support of language education.

The quantitative record alone is staggering, whether we view it in terms of the number of pupils learning, the number of teachers striving, the number of languages taught, the number of schools engaged in the enterprise, the number of pieces of equipment acquired, the number of studies produced, or the number of dollars spent.[11]

In 1959-60 there were 635,600 enrollments in regular programs of modern foreign language instruction in public elementary schools (kindergarten through grade six); in 1964 enrollment at this level was approximately 1,100,000. In 1958 enrollments in modern foreign languages in public high schools totalled 1,295,944, representing 16.4 per cent of the total high school population; in 1963 they had risen to about 2,600,000, approximately 25 per cent of the high school population. In 1958 modern foreign language enrollments in American colleges and universities totalled 425,404 (of which 13,323 were on the graduate level), representing about 17 per cent of the total four-year-college and university population; in 1963 they totalled 724,137 (32,215 on the graduate level), representing 20.3 per cent of the total number of persons enrolled in college. Since many of these students had had previous language instruction in high school, many were further advanced in language study than their earlier counterparts. (During the past three years, undergraduate majors in modern foreign languages have increased by about 25 per cent, and enrollments in intermediate and advanced college courses are increasing more rapidly than enrollments in elementary courses. Indeed, elementary enrollments are decreasing in some colleges as more students come to them capable of taking advanced courses.) In 1958 American universities granted 201 Ph.D.'s in modern foreign languages; in 1962 they granted 261.

---

[10] Parker's *The National Interest and Foreign Languages* includes an account of these events up to 1961. There is an account of the changes in public education that have re[illegible]d from Title III alone, based on the experience of California, in Donald W. Johnson, *The Dynamics of Educational Change*, Calif. State Dept. of Educ. (Sacramento, 1963).

[11] From 1958 to 1963, $135,009,479 was expended for language education under Titles III and VI of NDEA. This sum does not include expenditures for scholarships or loans for language study under Title IV, nor does it include expenditures by states and local institutions in those parts of the program which have a "matching fund" formula. Inclusion of these figures would swell the amount by many millions. The federal government's part of matching fund programs is often less than half. Under Title III alone, which provides matching funds for equipment, materials, minor remodeling, and some supervisory personnel engaged in language education, expenditures have amounted to $75,900,000. The program has been an important aid to schools and school systems; it has not been unimportant to publishers and to manufacturers of electronic teaching equipment.

There were some 47 "uncommonly taught" languages taught in American universities and colleges in 1958; in 1963 there were 75. In 1964, 90 were taught in NDEA-supported language and area centers alone. For the purpose, new teaching and study materials have been or are being prepared in 120 languages, for many of which such materials have not previously existed.

Language laboratories have grown in size, complexity, and number, and thousands of schools have improved their collections of modern language books and of other teaching materials.[12]

Not all of this development is attributable to NDEA support, of course. Interest in language study was rising before NDEA and stimulated the inclusion of provisions for language education in the Act. Foundations had provided funds for language development programs and continue to do so. The MLA FL Program was already six years old in 1958. Some schools and colleges had initiated new or improved language programs without the stimulus of foundation or federal funds—colleges used to do that.

A good many changes in language education cannot be described quantitatively at all. The qualitative record, harder to document and harder to interpret than the quantitative record, is at least as important.

The method of language teaching is in process of change. What has been variously called "the aural-oral method," "the Army method," "language in the new key," "the American method," and "the audio-lingual approach" continues to spread rapidly. It has become or is becoming the dominant method in many elementary and secondary schools and in some colleges.

---

[12] Before NDEA there were 64 high schools with electronic equipment (language laboratories) for language instruction; in 1964 there were estimated to be more than 6,000 high school language laboratories.

The content of language education is also changing. More stress on general knowledge of the foreign culture now often accompanies traditional stress on knowledge of the literature, especially for the younger students of elementary and secondary schools but also in the language and area programs characteristic of instruction in uncommonly taught languages in the colleges and universities. In the common languages, most colleges and universities continue to put their chief stress on *belles lettres,* but more of them also include more varied study of the general culture. The social sciences, not the humanities alone, provide some of the content of language education.

New materials and equipment (e.g., the language laboratory with its accompanying tapes, records, and recorders) foster the audio-lingual approach and serve to enhance competence in the spoken language. New texts and other materials are available to enhance understanding of the foreign cultures studied.

More than 15,000 elementary and secondary school teachers, a number equal to more than a third of those in the language teaching profession, have attended NDEA-supported institutes.[13] They have enhanced their mastery of the languages they teach (especially their mastery of the spoken language). They have been introduced to or have learned more about audio-lingual teaching. They have studied linguistics. They have enhanced their pedagogical competence—particularly in the use of electronic teaching equipment and the new teaching materials that accompany it.

Under MLA sponsorship, a committee representative of the profession of modern language teaching has described the expertise that the profession expects of secondary school language teachers, and under NDEA contract the MLA has prepared a battery of tests to measure seven kinds of competence for teachers of five languages. Several states have introduced these tests as part of the certification requirement for modern foreign language teachers.

[13] Because of the normal turnover in the teaching profession, this should not be taken to mean that a third of the teachers now in service have attended institutes. On the other hand, neither should it be assumed that all teachers in service should attend institutes. All teachers are under obligation to continue to learn, but the institute is not necessarily the most appropriate form of continuing education for all teachers. Surely many are capable of self-education.

The tests have also been used to evaluate the institutes in which language teachers have been given refresher or up-grade training under NDEA support. They are used by a growing number of colleges and universities engaged in teacher education as part of their procedure for recommending their graduates for certification. There are also new tests for the placement of lower level students and for the appraisal of their achievement.

There is a new supply of people with knowledge of formerly neglected languages.

The study of formerly neglected languages is growing rapidly. The teaching of some uncommonly taught languages has been introduced even into the high schools, to begin a stockpile of future experts. The MLA has produced a roster of students and teachers, classified by languages (*Manpower in the Neglected Languages, Fall 1962,* and *Manpower in the Neglected Languages, Fall 1963*). When the Peace Corps, the State Department, the Department of Defense, an international industry, or an educational agency needs people with competence in an uncommonly taught language, there is thus a means of locating them. Government agencies that provide language training for their personnel have found NDEA-supported materials the only available teaching materials for some languages and use them extensively.

The development of a new kind of expertness has been encouraged and supported by NDEA funds through the establishment and expansion of "language and area centers" in American universities for the study of critically important and uncommonly taught languages. There are 55 such centers in 34 universities. In 1963 they were giving instruction in 75 languages considered "critical" by the Commissioner of Education.[14] Language instruction in these centers is accompanied by instruction in "other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such language is commonly used . . . , including such fields as history, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography, and anthropology." These subjects are listed in the Act as eligible for NDEA support "to the extent adequate instruction in such fields is not readily available."

There has been a good deal of relevant research. For the most part, language research supported by NDEA funds has been oriented toward the teaching of languages—in a sense has been research in education. Experiments have been carried on with new techniques of teaching and with new materials. New equipment has been developed and tested. There have been experiments in language teaching by television, by "programing," by different uses of different laboratories. But when the development of new materials requires the linguistic analysis of languages hitherto not studied at all in this country or is based on comparative analyses of the structure of two or more languages, research in teaching merges with research in the language itself. Other supported research includes research in the psychology of learning especially oriented toward the learning of languages, studies of the psychology and sociology of bilingualism, explorations of the distribution of the world's languages and of their relationship to one another, inventories of the language resources of the country, and studies of the relevance of language study and of language competence to the national interest. There has been little support for literary research—none in the commonly taught languages—and little support for basic research in linguistics except as it is directly relevant to the preparation of teaching materials.

---

[14] A year later, in 1964, 90 such languages were taught in the centers, 66 with NDEA support.

The NDEA Language Development Program is obviously a many-splendored thing. Succeeding sections of this report will deal with issues still under discussion and with the several major parts of the program mentioned in this introduction: research, fellowships, the language and area centers, the institutes and other aspects of teacher education, and the provisions for support of specialist supervisors in state offices of education and for the purchase of teaching materials and equipment. Other chapters take a further look at the past and the future, summarize again the achievements that NDEA support has made possible in language education, and summarize the recommendations of this report. The emphasis in each chapter is on the future—not on achievements but on ways in which we may achieve still more.

II

Continuing Issues and Open Questions

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 was an emergency measure designed to strengthen American education, especially in subjects directly relevant to the national defense. In his message to the Congress recommending passage of the bill, President Eisenhower said: "Because of the national security interest in the quality and scope of our educational system in the years immediately ahead . . . , the Federal Government must . . . undertake to play an emergency role. The administration is therefore recommending certain emergency Federal actions to encourage and assist greater effort in specific areas of national concern. These recommendations place principal emphasis on our national security requirements." Of modern foreign languages in particular he said: "The American people generally are deficient in foreign languages, particularly those of the emerging nations in Asia, Africa, and the Near East. It is important to our national security that such deficiencies be promptly overcome."[1]

Explaining "The Purpose and Legislative History of the Language Titles in the National Defense Education Act, 1958" at an annual meeting of the Modern Language Association,[2] Lawrence G. Derthick, United States Commissioner of Education at the time the Act was passed, told his hearers that "the Congress believed that modern foreign language study was one of the serious 'imbalances in our educational programs'—an imbalance affecting 'the security of the Nation'," and he told them that "It was not, believe me, a rhetorical or promotional stunt when Congress decided to call Public Law 85-864 the National *Defense* Education Act." William R. Parker, the first Chief of the Language Development Program in the United States Office of Education, reminded a conference of English professors in 1961, in an unpublished speech, that "The original law . . . was a *National Defense* Education Act, in which a very few subjects were associated with our security in a cold war that can at any time explode." He added that he knew of "no Congressman who was cynical about this, as many people seem to be now."

---

[1] "Message From the President of the United States Transmitting Recommendations Relative to our Educational System," in *Science and Education for National Defense,* Hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Eighty-fifth Congress. U. S. Gov. Printing Office (Washington, D. C., 1958), pp. 195, 197.

[2] Lawrence G. Derthick, "The Purpose and Legislative History of the Foreign Language Titles in the National Defense Education Act, 1958," *PMLA,* LXXIV (May 1959), 50, 51.

The NDEA in 1958 was an emergency measure, then, concerned with the direct relevance of education, particularly of certain specified subjects, to the national defense. The title of the Act, the designation of the curriculum areas of mathematics, sciences, and modern foreign languages as areas in a state of imbalance, the assertion of the President in his message, and statements of many who testified in favor of the Act all said so.

In October 1964 the Congress extended NDEA for the third time, authorized much larger sums for appropriation during the three years of its extension, and added five subject areas eligible for NDEA support: English, reading, civics, geography, and history. It also added provisions for assistance in training school librarians, educational media specialists, and teachers of the culturally deprived. Current proposals for federal support of education envisage still larger sums and still other areas for support, whether they are to be implemented by revision of NDEA or by means of other legislation.

The Congressional action of 1964 changed the nature of the Act and indicates a new view of its purposes. Although the title of the Act is unchanged, and although references to defense in Title I, stating its general purposes, are retained in the amended version, direct relevance to defense is obviously no longer the criterion for the selection of categories for aid. The Congress might well have changed the title to the "National Interest Education Act." In any event, it is no longer to be viewed as an emergency measure designed to correct specific imbalances in American education in terms of an international crisis. It is no longer primarily oriented toward defense. It can hereafter be regarded as a means toward "the

Great Society," as a means of enhancing the quality of American life, as well as a means of national security. More specifically, it is a means by which the Congress supports those parts of the educational program of American schools and colleges which it regards as particularly important to the national interest broadly interpreted. It is the means by which the Congress, representing the American people, decides in general terms, and the United States Office of Education in more particular administrative terms, some of the directions in which American education should go.

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY

"There can be no question," James B. Conant says, "that the acts of Congress have greatly influenced educational policy in all the states. One might call this a Federal policy made possible by continuous bribery."[3]

But there is nothing sinister about it and nothing secret. It is what conscientious legislators and conscientious administrators are supposed to do. Commissioner Derthick told the MLA what Congress intended in Title VI of NDEA in 1958 and what the USOE expected. They expected the modern language teaching profession to change some of its habits:

> The emphasis . . . is on "new teaching methods and instructional materials," on discovering "more effective methods of teaching" and on the "need" by government, business, and industry for making language teaching more *functional.* Although it is not so spelled out in the Act, this concern and the countless words spoken in defense of the language title make it equally clear that the Congress hoped that language teachers would hereafter concentrate on making students proficient in the *spoken* language. . . .
>
> As a matter of fact, the whole legislative history of the Act makes it clear that the institutes therein provided are to be *modern* in methods, materials, and objectives—that they must, in their programs, reflect the fact that more and more Americans need the ability to communicate effectively in a foreign language. Hence, products of the institutes will be expected to make *measurable* improvement in listening comprehension and *speaking* ability—these two skills will presumably receive more attention than has been usual in American education, and also skill in reading and writing, knowledge of linguistic analysis, and knowledge of the culture of the people who speak the language natively.[4]

Of course a profession that accepted these objectives of language education and these means of achieving them could accept the money. Clark Kerr, President of the University of California, attributes to what he calls "federal grant universities" the attitude ascribed to

---

[3] James B. Conant, *Shaping Educational Policy* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), p. 116.

[4] "The Purpose and Legislative History . . ." p. 50.

> . . . a young lady from Kent
> Who said that she knew what it meant
> When men took her to dine,
> Gave her cocktails and wine;
> She knew what it meant—but she went.[5]

The modern language teaching profession may be said to have taken the same attitude. They knew what it meant and they went and they liked it.

There were a few who didn't. In 1959 a council of twelve leading Romance scholars protested to the Chief of the Language Development Program, USOE, what seemed to them the intent of the administration of NDEA "to prescribe rigidly, by direct curricular requirements or by the content of compulsory national testing programs, the means by which improvement of teaching is to be accomplished." They found in this intent "an unhappy and possibly dangerous precedent for Federal dictation of education."[6]

There have been other warnings not so much against federal aid and influence (although that debate continues, it has been decided) as against professional and institutional complaisance. Harold Orlans observes, for example, that "Their wish for greater federal aid has blinded many educators to the very real dangers: (1) that academic values and objectives will be surrendered to those of a business enterprise or the more important goals of a nation, and (2) that some form of political control will, indeed, follow federal aid. Not merely opposing, but the stronger step of refusing to participate in undesirable federal programs is, at times, necessary to manifest and, thus, to maintain an institution's independence."[7]

---

[5] *The Uses of the University* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1963), p. 69.

[6] A letter of 15 November 1959 from the Council of Big Ten Romance Language Chairmen, to Dr. Kenneth W. Mildenberger, then Acting Director, Language Development Program, U. S. Office of Education.

[7] Harold Orlans, *The Effects of Federal Programs on Higher Education* (Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institute, 1962), p. 292. Orlans comments that "The foremost recent example of such action is the refusal by twenty-nine institutions to take part in the NDEA student loan program because it required the 'disclaimer affidavit'," i.e., an affidavit from each borrower to the effect that "he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not sup-

Also speaking of the universities, rather than about education more generally, Clark Kerr tells us that "two great impacts, beyond all other forces, have molded the modern American university system and made it distinctive. Both impacts have come from sources outside the universities. Both have come from the federal government. Both have come in response to national needs."[8] And John Gardner, President of the Carnegie Corporation, says Kerr is "everlastingly right" in saying that "the main things that have happened to the universities in recent years have happened as a result of initiative from outside the universities." The universities, Gardner says,

> must make one final effort to regain some measure of control over their own destiny . . . it will . . . require a level of awareness and a quality of statesmanship throughout the academic world that has not existed to date. A number of college and university presidents, deans, and professors have staunchly faced the larger issues . . . but they cannot do the job alone. They must be able to count on an informed and active constituency that knows very well what is at stake. If such a constituency emerges, then those very able leaders will receive the backing they deserve and their effectiveness will be multiplied. And then the universities will be not only magnificent resources, as they are now, but masters of their own fate, which now they are not.[9]

This anthology of excerpts would not be complete without reference to the warnings from William R. Parker and Kenneth W. Mildenberger, the first two Chiefs of the NDEA Language Development Program. When Mildenberger complained of the "immense stillness" of the foreign language teaching profession since the advent of NDEA, he said in effect that the kind of leadership for which Gardner asks has not recently come from that profession: "It would seem as though the Modern Language Association Foreign Language Program of the nineteen-fifties had settled all the questions of the language field, and now it remains only for

---

port any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods." Orlans reports, however, that as of December 1951, only nine institutions had never taken part in the NDEA student loan program because of the disclaimer affidavit, only twenty had withdrawn from the program because of it (with two more expected to withdraw), but that eighty which had publicity stated their disapproval of it nevertheless continued in the program (p. 285, n. 5). Happily the affidavit is no longer required.

[8] *The Uses of the University*, p. 46. The two impacts are the Land Grant movement and the Federal Grant movement.

[9] John W. Gardner, in an address to the American Council on Education, San Francisco, 1 October 1964.

Government funds to implement FL Program policies and American education will be fully served."[10]

Parker was speaking to a conference on English in anticipation of the broadened scope of NDEA. He observed that his colleagues in English, the foreign languages, and other humanities have "recently displayed more expediency than wisdom, more greed than intelligence, in their attitude toward Federal aid to education. . . . Everybody says: 'Me too! If foreign languages are getting it, why shouldn't we?' Nobody is thinking hard about American education, or the role of government in education." He urged leaders of the English teaching profession rather to "discuss seriously the *implications* of Federal aid to education, and, if you then want English to be a recipient, be prepared to argue this, not in the spirit of expediency and 'Me too!' but in the framework of a larger, defensible philosophy of education."

It should be noted that these warnings are addressed to professional educators in the schools, colleges, universities, and state education offices, not to the "government." They do not warn us against federal aid nor against government interference but against our own blindness, complacency, ignorance, indifference, expediency, and greed. These are warnings to be heeded by members of the modern language teaching profession as they take part with others in what should be perennial review of the place of languages in education. In effect they urge members of the foreign language teaching profession, as individuals and through their professional organizations, to regard themselves as senior partners with the government in an educational enterprise, not as dependents of it. They also remind the other member of the partnership that it is a partnership. School and college people have an unfortunate tendency to think of USOE officials as "government" or simply as "they." School and college people on the staff of the USOE have an equally unfortunate tendency to think of themselves as *former* members of the profession. "Remember that I was one of you only six months ago," they may say.

If Mildenberger is right that the language teaching profession has failed in initiative since the advent of NDEA, those responsible for the MLA FL Program must share the fault. They have not reached the point where they can lean on their picks while they watch the steam shovel do their work. The MLA FL Program was important before NDEA. It was important in the shaping of NDEA provisions for language education. It now needs rejuvenation, and should direct the attention of the profession primarily to the educational problems rather than toward organizational, administrative, or financial problems of language education.

---

[10] Kenneth W. Mildenberger, in an address at Middlebury College, 13 August 1963.

LANGUAGES IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

Basic questions sure to be reopened again and again, certainly whenever the program of federal aid to education is reviewed by the Congress, include questions about the place of languages in American education. Who should study what languages at what levels? These are decisions that can neither be delegated to the language teaching profession alone nor preempted by its members. It is for them to define the objectives of language education and to state its values, to determine by what means these objectives and values can best be achieved and how much time it takes to achieve different levels of language competence. But others have a voice in determining whether achieving these objectives justifies the time it takes and who should be the beneficiary.

If some subjects and some school activities are to be supported and some are not (which is a basic assumption of categorical aid) and if greater and lesser sums are to be allocated for different purposes, the decisions should be made in terms of some set of educational or political principles—in terms of both the welfare of the individual student and the general welfare of the nation. It is not enough simply to say that languages have been neglected and deserve support. Whether language study deserves the student's time and how much of it depends in part on the claims of other subjects. In the context of what we expect American children and youth to learn in school, one of the crucial shortages in American education is the shortage of the time and energy of the student.

Recently, the judgment that foreign languages deserve special emphasis in our school programs has been made largely in terms of the national security and on the urging of a specially interested party—the language teaching profession. The public, to be sure, has also expressed interest in language education, in many communities has insisted on it. Prominent citizens have recommended it. The California legislature has required it. Local and state PTA's and the national PTA have urged it. Language programs and language laboratories have become prestige symbols for school systems.

The same is true, of course, in the same context, of education in science and mathematics, which are also most strongly urged by their practitioners and which also have special NDEA support. The public has insisted on these "hard core" subjects, too. It, or some sector of it, has also insisted on driver education, physical education, consumer education, citizenship education, family life education, education in music and art, character education, and vocational education. And also in the national interest.

Surely members of the foreign language teaching profession must take part with colleagues from other disciplines in the policy-making decisions governing the allocation of time and money to language education in American schools. Every school subject has its advocates. Representatives of each discipline, modern foreign language teachers among them, must recognize that none has an exclusive claim on the time and energy of the student. Educational decisions should not be made chiefly by practical compromise among interested pressure groups, however, but rather on the basis of a disinterested, philosophic view of education. The school curriculum has not been fixed and unchanging in the past; it will not be in the future. The place of languages in it should be and will be part of a continuing discussion.

FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Foreign languages are unique, or almost unique, among school subjects because the study of them may be and is begun at every school level. It is begun in kindergarten. It is begun in graduate school.

Growth of elementary school programs has been rapid during recent years. "One thing is certain," says Elton Hocking. "The teaching of foreign language, as such, is rapidly becoming the province of the schools rather than of higher education."[11] Of course the colleges will continue to teach beginning courses, but less and less frequently for students who have never before studied a foreign language. Already, beginning college classes have more and more students who are studying not their first foreign language but their second or third. And more and more students who have studied a foreign language in high school or in elementary school and high school enter college prepared for advanced study of the language they have studied previously.

The case for beginning the teaching of foreign languages in elementary school is a simple one. Children can learn foreign languages and master audio-lingual skills more easily, although not necessarily more rapidly, than adults or adolescents can. Even though they forget some of the words, Hocking says, "the melody stays." Those who begin the study of a foreign language early, properly taught, are more likely, within the limits of their vocabulary, to approximate the speech of a native speaker.

---

[11] "Casting out Devils," *NEA Journal,* Jan. 1965, p. 14.

In practice, in different schools and different school programs, foreign language in the elementary school (FLES) may begin in any grade. A not uncommon pattern is to begin a three-year sequence in the fourth grade, to be followed by a three-year junior high school sequence and finally by a three-year high school sequence.

Elementary school language instruction also takes many forms. Sometimes it is given by language specialists; the employment of subject-matter specialists in elementary schools is increasing. Sometimes language is taught by the grade teacher, whether or not she is trained in languages. Sometimes the grade teacher and the specialist collaborate. Sometimes the specialist or the grade teacher or the team depends on educational television. Sometimes the teacher is a volunteer from the community, teaching within the school day, or after school, or on Saturdays. "The bright promise of FLES . . . has often been blighted by well-meaning blunderers: dilettantes with their 'hat dance mentality'; academic specialists with their fondness for grammar and translation; immigrant war brides inflicting 'laundry lists' of nouns to be memorized. The soaring FLES enrollments have resulted in thousands of local experiments that start from scratch and frequently end there. Disappointment has developed a FLES backlash which threatens to discredit the entire movement."[12]

A California study (confirmed by experience in other states) reports that "Elementary schools employing competent teachers who speak a modern foreign language are enjoying reasonable success helping their pupils to develop conversational skills. . . . Using mechanical aids—television, tape recorders, and record players—to teach a modern foreign language has been relatively unsuccessful unless they were used by a competent teacher who was fluent in the language."[13]

[12] Ibid.

[13] Donald W. Johnson, *The Dynamics of Educational Change*, Calif. State Dept. of Educ. (Sacramento, 1963), p. 89.

One trouble is that the language the child learns is likely to be that of his teacher, whether the teacher's language is good or bad. In a few years, if not already, the high schools and colleges may find themselves unteaching a good deal of Madame Eglantyne's French, spoken "full faire and fetisly," but "After the scole of Stratford atte Bowe."

The MLA Foreign Language Program Advisory and Liaison Committee has been aware of the pressures that have brought FLES programs into being without adequate preparation and competent teachers. When, after three years of study, the Committee, with some reluctance, endorsed the rapidly growing FLES movement, it urged proponents of foreign language study in elementary schools not to initiate programs until "necessary preparations have been made. Necessary preparations include: 1) recruitment of an adequate number of interested teachers who have both skill in guiding children and the necessary language qualifications, 2) availability of materials appropriate to each age level, with new approaches and a carefully planned syllabus for each grade, and 3) adequate provisions for appraisal."[14]

Five years after this 1956 statement, the Advisory and Liaison Committee of the MLA FL Program issued a second statement affirming that "Hundreds of communities have ignored our warning against 'faddish aspects of this new movement' and our insistence on 'necessary preparations'." There is a set of cautions:

> A FLES program should be instituted only if: 1) it is an integral and serious part of the school day; 2) it is an integral and serious part of the total foreign-language program in the school system; 3) there is close articulation with later foreign-language learning; 4) there are available FL specialists or elementary-school teachers with an adequate command of the foreign language; 5) there is a planned syllabus and a sequence of appropriate teaching materials; 6) the program has the support of the administration; 7) the high-school teachers of the foreign language in the local school system recognize the same long-range objectives and practice some of the same teaching techniques as the FLES teachers.[15]

This important statement should be kept in mind by school authorities considering immediate initiation of FLES programs and by state language supervisors and others whom they may consult. It also has in it a good deal of guidance for those seeking to improve existing programs.

---

[14] "FL Program Policy," *PMLA*, LXXI (Sept. 1956, Pt. 2), xxi.

[15] "Foreign Languages in the Elementary School," *PMLA*, LXXVI (May 1961), vi-vii.

Where FLES programs have been carefully planned and prepared for and appropriately staffed, "you can always tell an ex-juvenile French student," Ruth Mulhauser says, when he gets to college. "He communicates in French, has no inhibitions about his second language, has no doubt that language includes audio and lingual aspects, and is blissfully unaware of nonsense about literal translations."[16]

There should be more FLES programs that yield such results. Some of those already in existence might well be designated and supported as demonstration centers, to serve as models for other schools and school systems initiating or striving to improve their FLES programs. NDEA funds to enable representatives of aspiring schools to visit or to take part in the programs of selected demonstration centers would be well spent. A school system establishing a FLES program should learn what a good one is and what it involves. To this end, in addition to studying model programs, administrators and teachers are well advised to consult with state language supervisors and with the panel of consultants that has been designated by the MLA.

There is still the question of the achievement that can be expected. A good FLES program requires a school to find competent elementary school language specialists or (which is hardly possible) to staff all its several grades with room teachers competent in the same language. It requires scheduling language lessons of from fifteen to twenty (in later grades, thirty) minutes a day in each class and in such a way as to enable a language specialist to meet each class. It requires special teaching equipment and materials. It requires planned articulation of the elementary school, junior high school, and high school language teaching. When all this has been done, what language competence can the child be expected to have?

There are a number of formulae for equating FLES teaching with secondary school teaching. It is not unusual to find that a child who has had six years of FLES or six years of FLES and junior high school language combined can continue his study of the language at a level equivalent to that of a second-year high school class. A child talented in languages may be treated as if he had studied his language for two years in high school. Another formula says that three years of elementary school instruction are equivalent to one year of junior high school and that two years of junior high school are equivalent to one year of high school. One pattern of articulation for an eight-four school organization suggests that FLES pupils be assigned to second, third, or fourth semester high school classes either by placement tests or by equating three primary school semesters with two upper elementary school semesters or one high school semester.[17]

---

[16] Ruth Mulhauser, "A Symposium, Foreign Languages in Elementary School," *NEA Journal*, Feb. 1960, p. 33.

Of course it is better to base placement of pupils on measured achievement rather than on years of instruction. But whatever the basis, the high school is advised not simply to assign FLES graduates to advanced classes but to accept the additional scheduling and staffing problems involved in providing special, separate classes for them.

By whatever formula we equate language study in the lower schools with later study, it is at least an open question whether the investment in staff and equipment, the scheduling difficulties, the administrative problems, and the expense are justified by the achievement that may be expected from a FLES program which is not staffed by expert language teachers working under optimum conditions.

At present we do not know enough about what can be achieved. We need to know not only into what grade in junior high school or high school we should place a juvenile language scholar; we need to know how well he performs at graduation from high school in comparison with those who began language study later. There have been good FLES programs in operation long enough to make possible the comparison of their products with comparable students who began language study later. There are now articulated programs (embracing elementary school, junior high school, and high school) that make possible longitudinal studies, beginning now, designed to find out how FLES students compare with students who begin language study later. Language teachers, in collaboration with their colleagues in psychology and education, should prepare proposals for such research: NDEA funds to support them would be well justified. There should also be further comparative study of learning under various patterns of FLES—as taught by specialists, by grade teachers, by television, and in various combinations.

---

[17] *FLES Packet,* A Compilation of Materials on the Teaching of Foreign Languages in Elementary Schools, MLA (New York, n.d., various years from 1954).

THE LANGUAGE SEQUENCE

Discussion of FLES raises the question of the length of the language sequence. Is a little learning truly a dangerous thing, or is it a valueless thing, or does it have its own value? Conant's observation that a student might as well play basketball as study a foreign language for only two years has been quoted often enough.

Whether or not a mere year or two of language study is a waste of time, it is not time enough to achieve reasonable objectives of language education. A school system that introduces a language program at any level should make some instruction available to its students until they graduate. A three-year high school should strive for a three-year sequence. If it cannot achieve this, the last two years of high school are the best time for the student to study a language, for then he can continue in college with only the interruption of a summer vacation. A four-year high school should strive for a four-year sequence. If there is language instruction in a junior high school, instruction in the same language should be continued in the senior high school. Conversely, when language instruction is introduced into a junior high school, it should be in a language taught in the senior high school. An elementary school program should be in a language taught in the high schools and should be continued until the pupils go to high school.

In short, the language program should be planned from the top down. It is folly to begin an elementary school program that will be discontinued at the junior high school. It is folly to provide language instruction during the first two years of high school if it cannot be continued through the last two. It is unwise (if the choice must be made) to introduce instruction in a second foreign language into a school program before a full sequence has been achieved in the first one—a sequence of at least four and preferably six years extending through the twelfth grade. The student is indeed more likely to "say something in basketball" after two years of instruction than to say something significant in French. Accordingly, a policy statement of the Advisory and Liaison Committee of the MLA FL Program asserts that ". . . while even limited instruction in a foreign tongue has educational value as a 'Copernican step,' it does not produce results commensurate with national needs on the one hand or the normal and natural expectations of parents and students on the other hand. . . . We urge that educational administrators, wherever and whenever possible, institute in our schools and colleges sequences of language instruction that will guarantee to those students with aptitude and interest the mastery they want and need to achieve."[18] When a language program is initiated, it should be with the expectation of developing a sequence that can result in reasonable language competence. Without that expectation, it should not be initiated.

ARTICULATION OF SCHOOL PROGRAMS

One of the key problems for the language teaching profession to solve is that of integrating the programs of the several levels of schools. In a school system, there may be gaps in the program when the child goes from elementary school to junior high school or from junior high school to senior high school. The programs of the several school levels are sometimes planned with little regard for one another. There are school systems, for example, which have FLES programs and senior high school language programs but no language instruction at all in junior high schools. There are some junior high schools teaching languages that are taught in neither the elementary schools nor the high schools of their systems.

At the college level, where students come from a great variety of high school language programs, the problem is particularly complex. As many high school language programs have improved, and as more and more students have begun language study before coming to college, the colleges find more and more students capable of more advanced study of foreign languages and literatures than a few years ago. In particular, they find them coming with more adequate audio-lingual skills. In some colleges, where the traditional heavy stress on translation and literary analysis has been little modified, these skills atrophy, or at best are not enhanced.

Many collegiate language departments have for a long time depended on placement tests to assign students to more or less advanced or more or less accelerated classes. The practice is spreading, and better tests make the assignments more and more satisfactory. But simple assignment to unchanged more advanced courses may not be the best solution. We need to reexamine the courses in which a student begins collegiate study of a foreign language in which he has fairly advanced skills. Perhaps college courses for students beginning a second or third foreign language should not be quite the same as those for students beginning their first foreign language. George Scherer finds that "In many cases the difficulty is not that the high school student is not well prepared for college courses, but that college courses are not well prepared for the high school graduate. . . . the colleges are going to have to adjust to the revolution in high school language teaching or they will represent a serious block to all the progress that is being made."[19] At every change of school there is danger of a break in continuity.

---

[18] "The Problem of Time," FL Program Policy Statements, *PMLA,* LXXI (September 1956, Pt. 2), xviii-xix. There are promising experiments with flexible scheduling. While it is surely desirable to continue high school language instruction through the senior year, it need not necessarily be a full course. One or two hours a week, rather than five hours, may be enough to keep language skills alive for some students, if not to advance them very much.

The foreign language profession, first through the MLA FL Program and more recently through NDEA-supported joint activities (often through the influence of NDEA-supported state language supervisors), has made some progress toward unification. Many teachers of different languages and teachers of languages at different school levels have come to recognize their common interest and their common cause. It is important that there be continuing conferences and other means of communication among language teachers at different school levels. Some such conferences should address themselves periodically to the coordination of language programs at the several school levels.

Stress on early beginning of language instruction and on extended sequences should not obscure the fact with which the present discussion began: that language study is begun at all levels. There must be appropriate beginning materials and appropriate sequential materials for every age and grade, for language study is also sequential and cumulative. Beginning at every level we need well-planned sequential programs and appropriate materials. Major publishers and major scholars and teachers are attacking this problem with energy and ingenuity. But the planning must involve many teachers at every level. The MLA FL Program, bringing together representatives of the MLA and of the various American associations of teachers of languages (the AAT's), teachers from elementary schools, high schools, and colleges, has in the past been the focus for joint professional activity by teachers from all levels of schools; it is an appropriate agency to resume and continue sponsorship of such activities.

[19] "FL Program Notes," *PMLA,* LXXIX (May 1964), *A-18.*

Chapter Two

WHAT LANGUAGES?

In so far as the study of a foreign language is in itself a valuable educational experience, it makes little difference what the language is. In so far as it is a means to studying literature, the significance of the literature makes a difference. In so far as it is a means of understanding a culture, the relevance of the culture makes a difference. In elementary schools and secondary schools, most people would agree (and if we may judge by school practice, most educators agree) that the commonly taught modern European languages or Latin should provide the student's first foreign language experience. At the elementary or secondary school level, most would agree that a second foreign language should also be one of the commonly taught modern European languages or Latin. If so, this leaves little place for uncommonly taught languages in the lower schools. In passing we may voice the hope that the Congress will soon see fit (in the light of the changed character of NDEA) to include the classical languages as an area for support and that the administrative ban on the classics in the award of Title IV fellowships (where the law does not exclude them) will be rescinded.

Although we may expect the commonly taught languages to remain dominant, some other languages are growing rapidly as high school subjects—Russian, notably, but Chinese and Japanese as well. Arabic, Czech, Modern Greek, Hawaiian, Hebrew, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, and Swedish are also taught in some American high schools.

The same warnings against "faddishness" issued by the MLA FL Program with reference to FLES apply to the introduction of uncommonly taught languages into secondary schools. There are basic questions to be asked. How well can the language be taught? It is not enough to have good, modern texts and teaching materials appropriate to the age group. We must ask whether the school can sustain a meaningful sequence in the language. Or is there likelihood that it will have to give up sequential classes either for lack of faculty or for lack of students resulting from the normal attrition in any sequential program? Will the students have reasonable opportunity to continue the language at the next level of schooling? Can they continue it in most of the colleges to which they are likely to go? The probable answers to these questions will limit the growth of uncommonly taught languages in the lower schools for some time. I think they should.

THE AUDIO-LINGUAL APPROACH TO LANGUAGE TEACHING

The audio-lingual approach to language education is far from universal in practice. The "grammar-translation" approach has been long established and is familiar, indeed habitual, to most teachers. Many language teachers have neither the language skills nor the pedagogical skills to change to the new method, although NDEA provisions for institutes, for state supervisors of language study, and for the acquisition of new equipment and materials have reduced their number. It has been assumed for a long time that two years of study of a foreign language is about all that can be expected of most students, and it has also been assumed that the reading objective is about all that can be achieved in two years. Most college and university language teachers (and therefore most of their students who teach in secondary schools) have been chiefly interested in language as a tool of literary study and have put much less stress on audio-lingual skills than on reading.[20] Some language teachers are opposed to audio-lingual teaching on principle. They regard it as a desertion from the humanistic values of language study.[21]

[20] The exclusive interest of most other departments in the university in "reading knowledge" for scholarly purposes has a good deal to do with it. The Ph.D. candidate in chemistry may be asked to translate a few paragraphs of a German technical article as a qualifying examination for his degree; it would be unfair practice to ask him to discuss chemistry in German. He should not be asked to do either. What he needs is ability to get the substance of a technical article quickly, which is not easy.

In these terms, ability to use a foreign language as a tool of scholarship is a reasonable objective. If it can be achieved more quickly by direct attack on the problem than by the indirection of audio-lingual teaching, it should be. We need carefully planned materials to meet this objective. It is an especially promising area for experiment with programed instruction. If teaching machines and programed lessons can enable us to dispense with cram courses for Ph.D. candidates and with special reading courses in "Scientific French," "Scientific German," and "Scientific Russian," it will be a happy day.

I do not mean to single out the sciences. Even the other humanities take the same view of the "language requirement." The qualifying examination in German for my own doctorate in English required me neither to read a German poet nor to scan a German article but to translate a few paragraphs from an encyclopaedia article on "The Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy." The requirement has not changed much in thirty years and is as senseless as ever.

[21] See, for example, Thomas O. Brandt, "Bull Market in Foreign Languages," *School and Society*, Summer 1964, p. 226: "We certainly are able now to say something in a foreign language much sooner, to converse with fewer

Opposition to audio-lingual teaching on this ground is based, I think, on misunderstanding. The audio-lingual approach does not substitute one goal for another; it reflects a broadening of the objectives of language education and a shift in emphasis. It does not substitute competence in the spoken language for competence in the written language; it adds it. And ability to read (especially ability to read without decoding) is enhanced by prior ability to understand speech and to speak. Moreover, the new equipment and materials save time and enable students to develop audio-lingual skills rapidly, for with the new equipment a whole class can practice these skills simultaneously. With the new methods and materials and the longer sequence advocated for language study, and more and more frequently provided for it, we are not required to choose between ability to speak and ability to read. Even if one skill did not support the other, there would be time for both.

Those who teach modern foreign languages need no longer be content (if they ever were) to measure their success solely in terms of their students' ability to translate. Instead, they seek as soon as possible to bring students to the point at which they can think in their second language—understand the spoken word, speak it, read without translation, and write without first formulating their thoughts in English.[22] More advanced study seeks to maintain and to enhance the audio-lingual skills while it places increasing emphasis on the content of language education. Freeman Twaddell makes the illuminating distinction between learning a language

---

inhibitions, to talk with greater continuity. But we have traded the ideological for the practical, the beautiful for the pragmatic, thought for action, the *how* for the *what*. . . . This reformation comes from without. It does not care for patient learning but for fast drill, not for elegance but for efficiency, not for cultural but for practical values, not for education but for instruction. It threw away its heritage and despised translation, forgetting that often we have to translate from English into English when we try to comprehend difficult passages or when we endeavor to express ourselves succinctly."

[22] It is difficult to discuss either the goals or the achievements of the audio-lingual approach without being unfair to traditional teaching. The traditional teacher also hopes to bring his students to the point where they can read without translating. He is not indifferent to the spoken language. His students sing, they read aloud, they hear him read aloud. Traditional programs in both high school and college include courses in "conversation." That separate courses are provided illustrates the difference between the two kinds of teaching, but it also illustrates commitment to the same objectives, although with different emphases and achieved by different methods.

and learning in it; an important objective of learning a language is to learn in it.

Commitment to the audio-lingual approach does not require language teachers to desert their commitment to the humanities, nor more specifically their commitment to literature. On the contrary, Parker has predicted, and most would agree, that in the future "The audio-lingual . . . approach to foreign language teaching will be generally adopted at all levels, and it will bring students quickly and surely to *direct reading* (without decoding), which in turn will make literary analysis and appreciation possible at an earlier stage."[23]

Enthusiasts for the audio-lingual approach are partly to blame for the opposition to it that remains. They have sometimes claimed too much and they sometimes overstate the deficiencies of traditional teaching.[24] Ever since World War II, when the Army Specialized Training Program and other military language programs were exciting the educational world and the public, the

---

[23] *The National Interest and Foreign Languages*, p. 13.

[24] Just as opponents of audio-lingual teaching set up straw men and attack what no one advocates (see note 21), so do its advocates sometimes attack under the designation "grammar-translation" what no one excuses. Hocking, for example, describes traditional teaching as follows ("Casting out Devils," p. 12):

"As We Were

Miss Smith: Our French lesson for today begins on page 37. Jane, please translate.
Jane (translating): 'The abbey put himself on end and said–'
Miss Smith: No, not 'put himself on end,' but 'stood up.' It's an idiom. And don't say 'the abbey.' By the way, what *is* an abbey?
Jane: I don't know.
Miss Smith: It's a monastery.
Jane: What's a monastery?
Miss Smith: It's the place where monks live. Now start over.
Jane (translating): 'The abbey–I mean the monastery–stood up and–'
Miss Smith: Please, Jane!
Jane: But that's what you just said.
Miss Smith: No, I mean that *abbé* doesn't mean 'abbey' . . . Robert, what does it mean?
Robert (waking up): Huh ? ? ? It means monastery.
Miss Smith: Oh dear, we'd better drill on vocabulary, and postpone our French conversation. So please take pencil and paper. . . ."

Miss Smith is manifestly incompetent. The fair comparison is with an audio-lingual teacher (there are some) who can neither speak the language nor operate the laboratory.

"Army method," identified with the audio-lingual approach, has been described as if it resulted in educational miracles. Given previous experience in language study, given large blocks of time, given talent, high motivation, persistent application, and first-rate instruction, many soldiers did achieve some functional fluency in foreign languages, and ability to read them, in a matter of months. A good many people have done it since. But not without most of those conditions. As there is no royal road to geometry, there is none to language competence.

THE CONTENT OF LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Sometimes advocates of the audio-lingual approach to language education seem not to claim too much but to ask too little, defining the objectives of language education too exclusively in terms of audio-lingual skills. In their consciousness of a shrinking globe, they ask (in the national interest) for "an adequate number of Americans with ability to communicate face to face with the people of any major nation,"[25] and do not always go on to ask for more than ability to converse. Surely this is too little. We need not only "an adequate number" of people who can communicate face to face, who can listen and speak. We also need people who can read and write. Especially we need people who have read and understood. What they have read and understood will have an important bearing on what they hear and say and write. Their ability to talk sense is even more important than their ability to pronounce "natively." An enthusiastic commitment to audio-lingual skills has sometimes led advocates of audio-lingual teaching to put insufficient stress on the content of language education, and this has invited the unconvinced to characterize the method as anti-intellectual.

Except in the heat of debate, audio-lingual enthusiasts do not settle for the skills of the spoken language alone. They do not ignore the things to be learned in the language when the language is learned. But what the best content for a language program is is also a subject of discussion in the profession. Here again it is difficult to formulate the issue without giving the impression that there are only two alternatives and that they divide the profession into two groups—those interested in studying the literature and those interested in studying the general culture of the area in which the language is spoken. The two are not mutually exclusive. Literature is one of the chief means of access to understanding of a culture; understanding of the culture illuminates the literature. The longer sequences of language study and the consequent greater competence in the language make it possible to broaden the content of language study, however, and there is increasing emphasis on the general culture (not to the exclusion of literature) at every level.

---

[25] D. Lee Hamilton, "Modern Foreign Languages and NDEA, Title VI," *Higher Education*, July 1963, p. 36.

In the lower schools this shift is partly an aspect of the emphasis on the spoken language. For one thing, in addition to basic drill in vocabulary and in sentence patterns, there must be something to talk about. For another, since, especially in the elementary school, instruction is for some time exclusively in the spoken language, there is no "reading" to talk about. There are illustrative objects, however, and pictures and film strips—all available with the aid of NDEA matching funds.

More important than these practical considerations is the broadened objective of language teaching, for there is a new emphasis on promoting international understanding by means of language education:

> Since language learning is not possible without subject matter, an appropriate, if not the natural, subject matter of a foreign language class is material which reveals the foreign culture . . .
>
> The implications for curriculum planning are clear: (1) since language is a medium through which the value systems of a culture are expressed, the acquisition of language and of cultural understanding should be a simultaneous, not separate, process; (2) the language itself should be taught, not just information about the language; (3) it should be taught in cultural context, not as an exercise in abstract reasoning. Each language class should take the students, so to speak, on a brief excursion into another way of life.[26]

This, surely, is an understandable objective, however difficult to achieve. I have yet to understand why my own high school generation spent thirty weeks laboriously plodding through Jules Verne's

---

[26] Marjorie C. Johnston, "How Can Modern Language Teaching Promote International Understanding?" *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals,* December 1956. Dr. Johnston is Director of the Instructional Resources Branch, Division of State Grants, USOE, engaged in the administration of Title III, NDEA. Her article grew out of a conference arranged by the MLA, in recognition of the need for an authoritative statement on this purpose for language education in the lower schools.

Voyage autour du monde en quatre-vingts jours. It took us on a long excursion into another way of life, no doubt, but not to France.

In the colleges and universities, in the uncommon languages, the language and area centers have developed interdisciplinary programs in which the language is indeed the means of studying the whole culture, in programs reminiscent of the wartime area and language programs.[27] In the common languages there has been less change of emphasis, but there has been some. Recent anthologies of readings for intermediate courses include other materials than *belles lettres.*

The change in the colleges will be speeded up, perhaps, by the demands of their teacher education programs. When high school teachers are required to teach not only the literature but also the broader culture of the language area, to teach literature in the context of the whole culture, the colleges and universities must teach them to do it. In response to this need a recent NDEA-supported MLA report on the education of college teachers observes that "Traditionally, courses in art, history, music, or philosophy have been used to complement the language and literature major. Two relatively new offerings, culture in the anthropological sense and linguistics, are coming to be regarded as especially useful to the future teacher. If such a course in the foreign culture is not available, an appropriate course in cultural anthropology would serve to cultivate the ability to see another culture in its own terms."[28] For potential college teachers, this report specifically recommends that "Unless an equivalent course has been taken in college, a one-semester course in cultural analysis and the culture of the foreign country should be taken by all graduate students," and it spells out the appropriate content for such a course. The place of linguistics in the language major and in the education of a language teacher is also under discussion.

The important thing is to keep discussion and experiment alive. Neither the audio-lingual approach nor the substance of language education is a fixed and static thing. New knowledge of linguistics and psychology, or new applications of them, new developments in the technology of teaching, new tools and materials, can contribute to the improvement of language teaching. New materials to supplement the study of literature by adding the study of the culture, and new approaches to it, are also being developed. Continued research in these fields deserves NDEA support and MLA encouragement. Presently available equipment and materials should not be allowed to freeze us into present curricula or methodologies. Neither should our teaching habits.

---

[27] For an account of this development, see Joseph Axelrod and Donald N. Bigelow, *Resources for Language and Area Studies,* American Council on Education (Washington, D. C., 1962), especially Ch. ii.

[28] Archibald T. MacAllister, "The Preparation of College Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages," *PMLA,* LXXIX (May 1964), 34. See also "Developing Cultural Understanding through Foreign Language Study: A Report of the MLA Interdisciplinary Seminar in Language and Culture," *PMLA,* LXVIII (December 1953), 1196-1218.

III

Research in Languages and Language Education

Research, studies, and surveys in languages and language education supported by National Defense Education Act funds have been broadly varied. Studies and surveys have been designed to find out the state of language education in the United States, to determine the need for increased or improved instruction, and to evaluate activities undertaken with NDEA support. Research in methods of instruction has undertaken to explore the psychology of language learning, to improve language teaching by the application of new psychological insights in the classroom and language laboratory, to make comparative studies of student achievement under different methods of instruction, and to provide standardized tests to measure student achievement and teacher competence in terms of the redefined objectives of language education. Specialized materials developed for instruction in the commonly taught languages have provided model texts, tapes, records, and other materials for the schools and for NDEA-supported institutes. They have had a marked influence on texts and other teaching materials produced commercially. Specialized materials developed in the uncommon languages are the only materials for instruction in some languages ranging "from Akan through Quechua to Zyrien."[1]

The areas in which research is to be fostered are made fairly explicit in Title VI of the Act: "The Commissioner is authorized directly or by contract to make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved instruction in modern languages and other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the

---

[1] D. Lee Hamilton, "Modern Foreign Languages and NDEA, Title VI," *Higher Education,* July 1963, p. 35.

areas . . . in which such languages are commonly used, to conduct research on more effective methods of teaching such languages and in such other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in such training, or in training teachers of such languages or in such fields."

Although the United States Office of Education has made some surveys and evaluative studies, most of the research projects have been undertaken, under contract, by agencies other than the USOE. Sometimes the initiative has come from the USOE, sometimes from the other party to the contract. Whatever their origin, research proposals are reviewed and approval or disapproval recommended by panels of experts. A report on the research activities of the first two years alone indicates that the USOE has sought "advice and counsel of more than 250 leading scholars and specialists in the various fields of inquiry."[2]

The USOE reports on NDEA-supported language research classify projects under four headings: (1) Studies and Surveys; (2) Methods of Instruction; (3) Specialized Materials for Commonly Taught Languages; and (4) Specialized Materials for Uncommonly Taught Languages.[3] During the first five years of the program (fiscal years 1959-63), the USOE contracted for 224 projects (under 248 contracts) at a total expenditure of $12,243,819. With this range of activities in mind, the Director of the Language Development Program, USOE, is able to say that "the Research Program is, in a sense, the specialized consciousness which integrates, monitors, and informs the other programs."[4]

FACT-FINDING SURVEYS

During the first five years of the Research Program, sixty contracts totaling $1,917,860 were made for studies and surveys related to the growth and improvement of language education in the United States. Among them was "Studies and Statistical Surveys of Modern Foreign Language Instruction in the United States," a 1959 contract with the Modern Language Association. This single project included twenty-eight different surveys covering such matters

[2] *Research and Studies, Report on the First Two Years,* USOE (Washington, D. C., 1961), p. 1.

[3] NDEA Defense Language Development Program, *Completed Research, Studies, and Instructional Materials,* U. S. Govt. Printing Office (Washington, D. C., 1963).

[4] Hamilton, p. 8.

as the number of students of each language at each level of education; modern foreign language offerings in schools and colleges; rosters of language teachers at all levels; manpower needs in language teaching; trends in the curriculum; language needs in government, business, and industry; and developments in the teaching of languages by means of television, radio, and language laboratories. Other studies and surveys include evaluations of the NDEA-supported summer institutes, first by contract with Middlebury College and later by contract with the MLA, and a "Survey of Non-Western Studies in Liberal Arts Colleges," undertaken by the Association of American Colleges. "Surveys and Studies," then, include both fact-finding and evaluative studies.

Prior to NDEA, the MLA Foreign Language Program had undertaken to gather facts about language education in the United States, with support from the Rockefeller Foundation, and the MLA studies had gone far enough to support the inclusion of foreign languages in the Act. But there was a good deal more to be done, and NDEA funds have made it possible to do a good deal more. Although we still cannot know the "facts" about other curricular areas in American education (for example, we do not have comparable information about the teaching of classical languages in the United States), and although many of our facts are already out of date, we now can know a good many facts about language education.

From the point of view of those with special interest in language education, perhaps this is satisfactory. But it ought not to be. The American educational system should not be dependent on foundations to provide means of gathering this kind of information. Neither should it be dependent on emergency legislation. Nor, finally, should information of this kind be available only in fields singled out by emergency legislation as in a state of imbalance. If it is important to know how many teachers with what preparation in what schools teach how many languages to how many children with what success at what cost and by what means, it is important to know these things about all segments of the curriculum—about science and mathematics, to be sure, but about all the other teaching we assign to the schools. Such information should be available about all education, and it should always be available.

An important function of the USOE is to undertake continued, comprehensive information-collecting about American education, not only about NDEA programs. But the Office has never had the money nor the trained personnel to perform this function adequately.[5] It does the best it can without the necessary resources. That it should have more money for this purpose has been said many times before.[6] The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should seek and the Congress should provide adequate funds to enable the USOE to be an adequate gathering place and clearinghouse of information about American education. Studies in language education should have been and should be part of the regular fact-finding function of the USOE.

Some of the surveys in the Language Development Program have been undertaken by contract. Thus the initial study of "neglected languages," upon which important priorities have been based, was undertaken in 1958 under contract with the American Council of Learned Societies. The most comprehensive compilation of facts about modern language teaching, *Reports of Surveys and Studies in the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages,* was undertaken by the MLA, under contract. Whether the bulk of fact-finding activity should continue to be accomplished through contract or whether the USOE staff should be expanded to handle it is surely an open question. The contract surveys have been competently done by people with special interest and special expertness. There is no reason why similar special interest and special expertness should not be enlisted for future surveys in this and other fields.

---

[5] The provisions of Title X, NDEA, have helped, but much more is needed, not only in the states but in the USOE. (Title X authorizes matching fund grants to states for the improvement of statistical services in state educational agencies, with a limitation of $50,000 for payment to any state during any fiscal year.) More and better information is already beginning to come to the USOE.

[6] See The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, *Second Report to the President,* U. S. Govt. Printing Office (Washington, D. C., 1957): "It is obvious to us who have served on this Committee that there is a most inadequate body of facts upon which plans within or without the Federal Government can be based . . . The farmers and business men are much better served by their Government, nor would they tolerate the deficiencies of facts and assistance in planning that are experienced by the educational community . . ." (pp. 106-107).

"The Committee . . . recommends that the following functions of the United States Office of Education be particularly reviewed and where necessary strengthened to enable that Office . . . as a matter of highest priority to increase substantially the effectiveness of its fact-finding and reporting services, using the most advanced techniques already in use in other fields of national interest, with the aim of supplying the Nation with a continuing flow of reliable and up-to-date information about conditions and trends in education beyond the high school" (p. 108).

EVALUATIVE STUDIES

Evaluative studies have been contracted in the same way, to good purpose. The Institute Program was evaluated for the first two years by teams of modern language scholars, under contract with Middlebury College. Since then, it has been similarly evaluated (in elaborate confidential reports and in more general published reports) by similar procedures under contract with the MLA. The Centers Program has been "inventoried" under contract with the American Council on Education, and a new evaluation of language teaching in the centers has been recently completed under contract with the Institute of Far Eastern Studies of Yale University.

Of course the USOE also undertakes self-evaluation; periodic reports on the activities of the Language Development Program and all its parts are prepared regularly. But there is outside evaluation too. It has been important to the quality of NDEA programs, perhaps most notably in the Institute Program, where the confidential reports have been used as the basis for recommended changes in practice and sometimes as the basis for a decision not to conduct future institutes at a given university. In some other parts of the Language Development Program, evaluative studies have been used only to suggest improvements, not as the basis for decisions on proposals for future or renewed contracts.

Quis custodiet ipsos custodes? "The profession at large," says the Chief of the Language Research Section.

The reports of evaluations are published, most of them. Proposals for research are reviewed by scholars in the field. Many NDEA activities, including parts of the Research Program, are planned by conferences of scholars, which are underwritten by research funds. But the Research Program has not been subject to systematic evaluation. It should be.

The recommendation may be generalized. All major NDEA activities in support of language education should be subject to periodic evaluation by contract with qualified outside agencies—institutions or professional associations. Such a program of evaluations would involve representatives of "the profession at large" still more deeply in the monitorial function. It would also strengthen the NDEA programs and result in fuller understanding of them by the profession.[7]

RESEARCH IN METHODS OF INSTRUCTION

From 1959 through 1963 there were thirty-one contracts for research in methods of teaching modern foreign languages, under Title VI, at a cost of $1,741,677. In general this research has fallen into three large categories: the place of languages in the school curriculum; the teaching-learning process; language learning equipment.

The governing principle in the award of these contracts is relevance to language teaching and learning. It is easy to interpret this principle too narrowly. The experiments and studies in methodology, defined in very practical terms, may have some immediate effect on language teaching, especially if the institutes make use of their results. The fact that research in linguistics and in more basic psychology may take a longer time to be applied in the classroom should not give it a lower priority. Surely the USOE has been right to sponsor both kinds of research, and both kinds should be continued.

There have been such projects as: experimental refining and strengthening of undergraduate language curricula; experimentation to determine the extent to which close correlation of foreign language study in another subject area has a measurable effect on pupil achievement in either area. Research in the teaching-learning process has included: extended classroom experimentation with varied sequencing of the four skills in German instruction; experimental analysis of the control of speech production and perception.

Among research contracts on language learning equipment are: the effect of preliminary training in pronunciation discrimination upon learning of French pronunciation with recording devices;

---

[7] One other very desirable source of evaluative studies is outside the control of the USOE: studies by private agencies not supported by NDEA funds. Sidney Sufrin's *Administering the National Defense Education Act* (Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1963) and the present study of the Language Development Program are cases in point. Each has been supported by grants from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Whatever the bias of their authors, whatever the special interest of their sponsoring agencies (e.g., the MLA), evaluative studies not based on NDEA contracts have obvious advantages.

experimentation in the development of more effective methods of teaching languages by making extensive use of electromechanical aids. There have also been studies in the nature of language: e.g., the general phonetic characteristics of language.

TITLE VII RESEARCH IN NEW MEDIA

By no means all the NDEA-supported research in methods and materials for teaching modern languages has been under Title VI contracts. Title VII of the Act authorized contracts for research in the uses of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes. It also authorizes contracts for the dissemination of information about the new media. No subject is proscribed. Even Latin is eligible, and one contract was for an investigation of "the use of automated instructional devices in teaching elementary Latin."

A good many experiments with new media are relevant to a wide range of subjects. An experiment in "the use of television for improving teacher training and for improving measures of student-teaching performance" may apply to teachers of any subject. An attempt to improve "the quality of teacher performance by use of the video tape recorder" may apply to any kind of teaching. An evaluation of communications media used in an adult liberal studies program surely does not exclude languages.

In addition to such studies of general significance, however, there have been Title VII contracts for research in the use of the new media, specifically in the teaching of languages. A 1962 report lists sixteen projects as specifically concerned with language teaching,[8] not including under the heading "language" such studies as one designed to improve "language arts of bilinguals through audiovisual means." The projects listed under "language" include such studies as: a comparative evaluation of two modern methods for teaching a spoken language; experiments with the applications of the audiovisual and automatic devices to the teaching of French; factors within the program of a teaching machine which influence foreign language learning; the construction and evaluation of a self-instructional program in Russian; a comparison of four variations of language laboratory instruction in beginning French.

The important *Language Laboratory Facilities, Technical*

---

[8] *Projects Initiated Under Title VII, Part A, National Defense Education Act:* 2 September 1958–30 June 1962, USOE (Washington, D. C., n.d.).

Guide for the Selection, Purchase, Use, and Maintenance, by Alfred S. Hayes, published by the Government Printing Office, was prepared under a Title VII contract. It illustrates the program to disseminate information about the new media (Title VII, Part B). The MLA *Selective List of Materials* is another example. Other projects under Title VII, Part B, like some under Part A, are not concerned specifically with language education but are relevant to it: for example, a contract for the "preparation of a complete and exhaustive file of research abstracts in the educational media field."[9]

RESEARCH IN NEW TEACHING MATERIALS

One of the important pre-NDEA contributions of the MLA FL Program and of the American Council of Learned Societies was the preparation of new materials for the teaching and study of foreign languages. Teaching guides and accompanying records were prepared for elementary school teachers in French, German, and Spanish. *Modern Spanish,* a committee-written textbook commissioned by the MLA FL Program—soon to be followed by a second text, *Continuing Spanish*—was intended to be a model for textbooks using the audio-lingual approach at the college level. Production of materials in uncommon and neglected languages has been a concern of the ACLS for a long time.[10]

NDEA-supported research has continued and expanded these activities, encouraging the development of new materials for instruction in the common languages in the lower schools and giving great impetus to the development of new materials in neglected languages.

MATERIALS FOR TEACHING THE COMMON LANGUAGES

During the first five years of the program there have been thirty-five contracts, totaling $3,417,449, for the development of specialized teaching materials in the commonly taught languages. Among these projects were a contract with the MLA to produce "Tests to Measure Qualifications of Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages (French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish)"; and a contract with the Glastonbury (Connecticut) Public Schools to produce "Audio-Lingual Materials for the Teaching of French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish in the Secondary Schools."

---

[9] *Projects Initiated Under Title VII, Part B, National Defense Education Act:* 2 September 1958–30 June 1963, USOE (Washington, D. C., 1963).

[10] This activity antedated World War II and was basic to the Army Specialized Training Program and other war-time language programs.

The support of the Glastonbury (*A-LM*) materials in five languages, begun early in the NDEA program, reflected a belief on the part of the USOE that satisfactory materials would not be produced, or would not be produced quickly enough, even in the common languages, without support. The Director of the Language Development Program reports on the activity as follows:

> The Research Section has also been active in updating teaching materials in the more commonly taught languages (French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish). There was no lack of introductory textbooks, of course, but the problem was that they stressed the ability to read and write rather than the skills of speaking and auditory comprehension. Therefore the Research Section contracted for the preparation of materials in these languages and subsequently, after receiving bids from commercial textbook publishers, licensed one firm to produce and market the materials. Thus for the first time in American education thousands of youngsters in the secondary schools could plan to move for at least 4 years in a straight line toward an active speaking ability in a foreign language by using an integrated series of textbooks. Through this means the Office of Education hoped, of course, to encourage other publishers to enter a field which they had so far thought did not offer a good market. The effort proved successful, and now there is increasing competition between course materials with similar aims in the common languages.[11]

There is some rationalization in this account. The *A-LM* materials were not the first appropriate materials available in some languages, and commercial publishers were also engaged in the development of audio-lingual materials for the lower schools. But the *A-LM* materials were the first available in all five languages. They were the first to provide a four-year audio-lingual instructional sequence in four of these languages. They were needed not only for use in the schools but also for illustration and demonstration in NDEA institutes for teachers, and they have been widely used for that purpose. Indeed, they have been so widely used in the institutes that it has been suggested that directors of institutes think the USOE specifically encourages the use of NDEA-supported materials in preference to others. There is no such intention. The present USOE policy is to support the development of teaching materials in the common languages only if satisfactory materials are unlikely to result from the usual procedures of commercial publication.

---

[11] Hamilton, p. 35.

Other materials relevant to the teaching of the common languages, particularly to the education of language teachers, include a *Guide for Teachers in NDEA Institutes* and *An Accompanying Anthology,* prepared under the editorship of Simon Belasco. These materials, commonly called "the Belasco materials," have provided a basis for a good deal of the instruction in applied linguistics in the institutes. Now available through a commercial publisher for French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish, they will have broader use. Other commercial publishers have produced competing manuals.

TESTS

The most important of all the common language materials produced under research contracts are achievement tests in French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish for students in grades seven to fourteen (administered by the Educational Testing Service) and a battery of proficiency tests for teachers and advanced students (also available for the same five languages from the Educational Testing Service). The proficiency tests, like the *A-LM* and Belasco materials, have been tried out in the institutes.

The tests for teachers cover seven areas of competence: ability to understand the spoken language, to speak it, to read it, to write it; applied linguistics; culture; and professional preparation. As a definition of the competence expected of teachers and as a means of measuring it, they may have far-reaching consequences. Several states have used them to certify teachers who do not meet prescribed course and credit requirements for certification but who have acquired the necessary knowledge and skills outside the classroom. Other states are considering using them as a regular part of the certification procedure. They are used in a growing number of programs for the education of teachers. The Director of the MLA FL Program comments on their importance as follows:

> We should now like to see their use extended to all *regular* candidates for teaching. Here is a testing instrument that no other subject-matter field now has, an instrument that will make it possible for department chairmen or other administrators to assess the qualifications of teacher candidates in seven areas, including the four language skills. James Bryant Conant . . . recommends "enthusiastically to all colleges and universities training foreign language teachers that they use this proficiency test to determine who is to be certified as a teacher. The counting of semester hours should be scrapped."[22]

---

[22] Donald D. Walsh, "The FL Program in 1963," *PMLA,* LXXIX (May 1964), 25.

The preparation and standardization of tests is expensive. The operation of a testing program is expensive. Tests are always subject to improvement, and new forms of the present tests are needed. Not everyone agrees with the emphases of the present tests, and new tests will be needed as the profession reviews, modifies, and sharpens its views of the competence that teachers should have. Support of this important activity should be continued, so that present tests may be improved, so that alternative forms may be developed, and so that other tests may be developed when they are needed. The tests already in existence make it possible for institutions engaged in the education of modern language teachers to base their recommendations for certification on recently tested proficiency in addition to, or instead of, counted credits. If colleges and universities can be persuaded to do this, it may be one of the most important NDEA contributions not only to language education but also to American education generally. Surely the MLA and other professional associations of language teachers should continue to recommend the practice.

SOME FURTHER NEEDS

Some materials important to the education of future teachers of modern languages are still lacking. In none of the common languages is there an adequate, recent, advanced reference grammar for American students and teachers. There is nothing like a canon of materials to teach the culture of the language areas of the common languages. Conferences on this topic have been sponsored by the MLA and the USOE over a period of years. The USOE has made it clear that it would welcome sound proposals for the production of area materials in the common languages. Scholars have provided neither the materials nor the proposals. The MLA might well take the initiative in procuring them. Or the initiative might come from any interested scholar or team of scholars and teachers. There have been many presentations of the culture in the summer institutes. Perhaps some of them, put in shape for more general distribution and use, may be the beginning.

There is no longer a need, however, to subsidize the development of basic texts and materials for instruction in the common languages as such. The *A-LM,* the Belasco materials, the tests (and some commercially produced materials not supported by NDEA funds) have set examples. Important as model materials are, presumably they do not have the quality of major classics and will not last forever. Some of them need major revision already. But, except perhaps for the tests, it can be assumed that market demand will produce continued progress. Accordingly, future support for the development of teaching materials in the commonly taught languages should be restricted to such materials as advanced reference grammars and materials for the teaching of the culture, to genuinely experimental new approaches, and to the continued development of testing programs.

The changed emphases in NDEA, the broader scope given it by the amendments of October 1964, suggest the propriety of support for literary research. If money is available for research in language learning, in teaching methods and materials, and in area culture, but not for literary study, the result may easily be a new imbalance. Whatever is taught in the university should be studied in the university. Anything that diverts scholarly attention from an important field of knowledge must in time result in inferior teaching in that field, for in the university vital teaching must depend on current, vital scholarship. In the early days of the Act, it would have taken a very broad interpretation of the word *defense* to justify support of professorial monographs on Cervantes, Dante, Goethe, Molière, or Pushkin under an emergency measure designed to correct defense-related imbalances in American education. But a broadened program designed to enhance the quality of American life cannot afford to ignore the tradition of humane scholarship.

RESEARCH IN THE NEGLECTED LANGUAGES

A large commercial market for teaching materials in Hausa, Yoruba, and Igbo[13] is unlikely, although there is some demand. But Peace Corps activities and other developments have already resulted in a boom in Swahili.[14] Materials produced for the study of Vietnamese have had their uses also. Who knows for what uncommon language we shall have special need tomorrow?

---

[13] Each spoken by more than three million people in Nigeria, a part of the world in which the United States has growing interest. Teaching materials for these languages have been produced under NDEA contracts and published by the U. S. Government Printing Office. There is more demand for them than their unfamiliar names would lead us to expect, and it is not likely to be a declining demand.

[14] An "uncommon" language in the United States, but not in the world as the world's languages go. It is the common language of much of East Africa and is spoken by some 55 million people—more than the population of France.

Before World War II, there were two located copies of a valuable Japanese-English/English-Japanese dictionary in this country (a Japanese publication). People who anticipated the future were unable to get authorization from the War Mobilization Authority to buy 500 copies at (if I remember rightly) $1.25 each. After Pearl Harbor, the University of Chicago Press reprinted the book—with obvious loss of time and money.

A program supported by the Ford Foundation, which has commissioned projects in thirty-eight languages, has resulted in the publication of some thirty textbooks, readers, grammars, vocabularies, dictionaries, and other instructional aids. Mortimer Graves speaks of this program as "primarily . . . a stockpiling operation analogous to the stockpiling of critical natural resources."[15]

As a stockpile for the future, as well as for immediate use, research in neglected languages is an important activity of the USOE Language Development Program. Many important languages have been virtually unknown in this country. During the first five years of the program, a total of $5,197,599 was expended for 119 projects in neglected languages. Now, largely as a result of NDEA support (but also through the continued activities of the Ford Foundation and other foundations), teaching materials are available or under development in scores of languages. By 1963, 170 publications had resulted from NDEA Title VI research projects in the neglected languages. About 130 of these may be considered "tools of access" to uncommonly taught languages.[16]

[15] *Language Doors,* Ford Foundation (New York, 1964), p. 19. These materials were produced as the result of 1952 and 1956 grants (totalling $500,000) to the ACLS. The Center for Applied Linguistics, established in 1958 on the basis of a grant to the MLA and since then supported by other grants, has continued the development of teaching materials in uncommonly taught languages—often on the basis of NDEA contracts with the USOE.

[16] Hamilton, p. 35, describes the basic tools of access as follows: "a systematic introduction to the language, complete with grammatical analysis, glossary, and editorial notes; a dictionary; graded reading materials, preferably including some analysis and commentary on the foreign culture of which the language is a part; and a separate reference grammar, fully indexed." If native informants are not readily available, recordings and planned laboratory exercises also become essential, and are desirable in any case.

The USOE has contracted for specialized materials in at least one of these categories for 115 uncommon languages. There have been contracts for 20

Although contracts can be awarded only when there is a scholar competent and willing to work on the language in question, there have been priorities established, on the basis of contract studies undertaken by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Center for Applied Linguistics. At the beginning of NDEA, six languages were listed as of critical importance and relatively neglected (although this does not imply the absence of teaching materials in all of them). They were Arabic, Chinese, Hindi-Urdu, Japanese, Portuguese, and Russian. Eighteen other languages were placed in a category of immediate but less critical concern. The other languages in the first list prepared constituted a third category. The list has been revised several times, with more languages added to the priority groups each time.

Wisely, the USOE has not assumed the need for the basic "tools of access" to be the same for all languages nor sought to procure all the desirable materials for all languages. Among the world's thousands of languages, we must resign ourselves to being ignorant of some. If we need tools of access for 163 languages,[17] the need is not equally urgent for all of them, nor do we need the full complement in all. In some no doubt we need more advanced materials than we have. There should be periodic inventory of our human resources in the uncommon languages and of our resources for teaching and learning them and a periodic review of our national needs.

THE DIRECTION OF FUTURE RESEARCH

The USOE has the problem of spending specified sums of money for research. It must choose among proposals it receives or it must invite proposals for research where it sees the need.

It does both, and both by inviting proposals and by its selection of proposals to be approved, it influences the direction of research and the kinds of research undertaken. Its use of advisory panels has involved the profession but has not been particularly effective. Applicants for contracts look carefully to see what kinds of proposals have been approved and listen carefully to USOE officers when

---

linguistic analyses in such languages as Arabic, Finnish, Kannada, and Telegu. There have been contracts for 84 basic courses, 71 readers, 33 reference grammars, 34 dictionaries, 90 recordings, 25 bibliographies, and 24 language manuals.

[17] The number arrived at by a national conference of specialists held in March 1961.

they describe areas in which research is needed. The chairman of a foreign language department visiting Washington can easily hear his colleagues at home urging, "While you're up, get me a grant." Some future research is certain to be shaped by past success in money-getting.

But research plans patterned on research plans that have won support may not be the best plans. Especially in research, a tendency to play it safe is stultifying. Future studies modeled on past ones will not give new directions to our advancing knowledge, and the profession should be particularly wary of any tendency to resign to government its responsibility for leadership and initiative in research. The profession should determine the direction of research, and the MLA FL Program should sponsor continuing conferences on needed research not only in languages and literature but in linguistics, in language learning, language teaching, and language areas. The language teaching profession ought also to be involved in continuous analysis and inventory of national needs and resources in the languages and in attempts to anticipate what languages, in the course of events, may become critical.

The recommendation that major responsibility for such planning should shift from government to professional organizations and committees should not, however, obscure the fact that much, indeed most, of the significant research in modern foreign languages, literatures, and areas is accomplished by individuals, not by teams, committees, or organizations. It is done by professors writing books and Ph.D. candidates writing dissertations. Ultimately the initiative must come from imaginative individuals motivated not by the passion for grants but by the scholar's passion for discovery.

PUBLICATION

A crucial problem of the Research Program is the dissemination of its results. Research contracts may require the contractor to supply the USOE with *not more than* 225 copies of a final report. These are distributed by the Office if other publication is not available. Although other publication is encouraged, the Language Development Branch is not in the publishing business and cannot subsidize publication.[18] Often the 225 copies provided and any "over-run" undertaken by the contractor are the only publication. A 1963 list of *Completed Research, Studies, and Instructional Materials*[19] lists 249 studies. Of these, 78 are listed as available only from the "author or project director," sometimes, to be sure, because they are still in "preliminary editions," sometimes because they are available only as reprints of articles published in professional journals, but sometimes because there has been no formal publication and the USOE supply is low.

---

[18] A few products of the Research Program have been published by the U. S. Govt. Printing Office, e.g., basic courses in Hausa and Yoruba. But such publication is now contrary to general policy.

Broader publication is not warranted for all the projects completed. Some are tentative or preliminary studies and should not be published until they are revised. Some are of interest to very restricted groups. No doubt some do not deserve publication, but reproduction of every research project report on microfilm would assure their availability. By whatever means, there should be better provision for publication and for keeping results of the research project in print. Mute scholarship remains inglorious.

[19] National Defense Language Development Program, *Completed Research, Studies, and Instructional Materials,* List No. 3, U. S. Govt. Printing Office (Washington, D. C., 1963).

IV

Fellowships for Modern Foreign Language Scholars

The National Defense Education Act provides for two kinds of fellowships for which students of modern foreign languages are eligible.

Fellowships granted under Title VI are exclusively for students who plan to study languages and by administrative ruling have been restricted to "critical" or "neglected" languages. The foreign language need not be the primary field of study, however. The fellow may be a social scientist, for example, preparing to teach in an area studies program or for other approved public service. The graduate degree toward which he is studying need not be in the foreign language department. Indeed, although about 90 per cent of Title VI fellows are preparing for academic careers, only about 40 per cent cite language teaching as their career goal.

Fellowships granted under Title IV are not restricted to students of foreign languages but are open to them.

NDEA FELLOWSHIPS, TITLE IV

The Title IV Fellowship Program has two primary purposes: to help strengthen and expand facilities for graduate study in the United States and to help increase the supply of college teachers. Fellowships have been awarded for study of specified subjects at designated universities, in order to combine assistance to the student with assistance to the institution. To receive Title IV support, a university has been required to apply for it and to submit for approval by the Commissioner a program of graduate study which it shows to be new or to have been expanded not merely by increase in the number of students but by extension of the program, addition to its faculty, and the like.

For example, addition of courses enabling a graduate student in English or a modern foreign language to take hitherto unavailable work in linguistics might be regarded as an expansion of a program. Addition of a specialist in the history of science to the faculty of a history department heretofore unable to staff courses or guide doctoral dissertations in that area might be regarded as an expansion of a program. Initiation of Ph.D. work in an area in which a university has in the past awarded only the master's degree might be considered a new program. Willingness of a department to accept more graduate students without other change in the graduate program has not been regarded as constituting a "new or expanded" program.[1]

Title IV fellowships carry stipends of $2,000 for the first year, $2,200 for the second year, and $2,400 for the third year, plus $400 for each dependent of the fellow. There are accompanying grants to the universities: each institution is paid $2,500 per academic year for each NDEA fellow studying in its program, less any tuition it may charge. The life-expectancy of each fellowship is three years, although some one-year and two-year fellowships have been awarded to more advanced students. (Since the second year of the program, 150 a year have been reserved for this purpose.) Fellows are required to be essentially full-time students but have been allowed to do some teaching: e.g., one-fourth time in some instances.

For the fiscal year ending 30 June 1959 (the first year of the program) 1,000 fellowships were authorized; 1,500 have been authorized for each year since, and the quotas have been filled.

No subject was excluded by the language or apparent intent of the 1958 Act, which specified that:

> The Commissioner shall award fellowships . . . to individuals for study in graduate programs approved by him. . . . The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding (1) that such program is a new program or an existing program which has been expanded, and (2) that such new program or expansion of an existing program will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation, and (3) that in the acceptance of persons for study in such programs preference will be given to persons interested in teaching in institutions of higher education.

[1] The revision of the Act made in October 1964 provides for a large number of fellowships which need not be allocated to "new or expanding" programs. Some implications of this change are discussed below.

The new legislation (October 1964) authorizes many more fellowships than the Act of 1958: not more than 3,000 during the fiscal year ending 30 June 1965; not more than 6,000 during the next year; and not more than 7,500 during each of the two succeeding years. The amended Act no longer restricts all the fellowships to new or expanded programs but requires instead that not fewer than 1,500 be awarded for study in such programs during the fiscal year ending 30 June 1965, and not less than a third of those awarded during the succeeding three years. The remainder may be awarded as the Commissioner may determine, subject to the provisions that recipients "shall be persons who are interested in teaching, or continuing to teach, in institutions of higher education and are pursuing, or intend to pursue, a course of study leading to a degree of doctor of philosophy or an equivalent degree." In the 1964 amendment, there is specific prohibition of fellowships "for study at a school or department of divinity."[3] No other department is excluded.

It needs no lawyer to make the judgment that the intent has been to foster the expansion and strengthening of facilities for graduate study in the United States and the encouragement of potential college faculty *in any subject*. It has been so interpreted by those who administer the program in the USOE, who have taken satisfaction in the opportunity to assist a great variety of programs in the humanities, as well as programs in the sciences and social sciences for which federal support has been available from other sources also.

Accordingly, under the heading of *Humanities,* the names of programs supported during the years 1959 to 1965 are listed substantially as follows in a USOE summary report: archeology, art history, Buddhist studies, church music, comparative religion, dramatic art, fine arts, folklore, "humanities," music, musicology, non-Western art and archeology, Old Testament, religion, speech, theology, American studies, Hebrew culture and civilization, Near Eastern studies, classics, comparative religion, English, medieval linguistics and literature, Victorian literature, twentieth-century literature, linguistics, communication sciences, modern languages, Chinese, Slavic languages and literature, Russian, German, French, Italian, Spanish, Romance languages, philosophy. Various "area studies" listed under the heading *Social Sciences* and a good many programs in the social sciences that make up area studies programs should be added to show in full the emphasis on the humanities and more particularly on modern foreign languages in the Title IV program.

---

[3] Defined as follows: "The term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution, or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects."

There is now a taboo list of subjects, however, in which fellowships are not awarded (and hence of departments not assisted) by agreement between the USOE and certain congressmen. For example, since 1962, the end of the first three-year fellowship period, there have been no fellowships in art history, music, musicology, dramatic art, religion, comparative religion, theology, or classics, all of which were represented in the first group of fellowships. The exclusion of students of such subjects as classical languages, folklore, and music from support under a National *Defense* Education Act is understandable, but not if there are only a few such exclusions. The congressmen who have "advised" the USOE to exclude certain subjects from NDEA support include advocates of NDEA who thought its renewal might be jeopardized if there were no assurances that such subjects would be excluded. Neither congressmen nor officers of the USOE should be expected to ignore political realities, but we may deplore the influence of those realities. If the two objects of Title IV are to strengthen and expand graduate facilities and to increase the supply of college teachers, there is no rationale for the exclusion of the taboo subjects.

The numerical record shows the extent to which Title IV has aided the initiation and expansion of graduate programs for potential college teachers. During the first six years, 8,500 fellowships were awarded for study in 1,238 approved programs on 174 campuses in 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Two hundred fifty-five of these programs were in the "humanities," of which 109 were specifically in modern foreign languages, linguistics, or comparative literature. Prior to 1962 there were ten programs in classics.

No one can say that these fellowships have brought approximately 8,500 young scholars into college teaching. We do not know how many would have pursued their graduate education without NDEA support, and some will not become college teachers anyway. (A follow-up study of what has happened to the early Title IV fellows is surely desirable, as would be a continuing study of future fellows.)[3] Nor can we know what universities would have undertaken the supported expansion without support. Graduate education is one of the fastest growing segments of higher education and undoubtedly would be whether or not there were NDEA fellowships.[4] Nevertheless, the Title IV program has had significant impact. It has encouraged the expansion and broader geographical distribution of facilities for graduate education and has enabled thousands of young scholars to pursue graduate study as full-time students. By its hospitality to almost all disciplines, it has given important recognition to the fact that the nation's interest is not restricted to a limited list of defense-related subjects.

QUANTITY AND QUALITY IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

The great expansion of the Title IV program and other changes provided for in the amendments to the Act made in October 1964 will require the USOE to review Title IV regulations.

The former restriction of fellowships to new or expanded programs was consistent with the intent to strengthen (at least to multiply and expand) graduate programs. But it tended to exclude fellows in many established fields of study from the universities which already have strong programs. Often it sent future college teachers to weak graduate schools.

This is not to say that our greatest universities have not had NDEA Title IV fellows. Their new or expanding programs have

[3] There have been such studies, but they are neither complete nor continuous. "In 1962, approximately 670 students who had received awards for three years of study beginning in 1959-60 ended their fellowship tenure, in addition to 76 students who had been awarded 2-year fellowships beginning in 1960-61, and 6 who had been granted 1-year awards in 1961-62. Of this group, 101 fellows have reported that they completed all the requirements for the Ph.D. prior to September 1962. . . . A total of nearly 525 of the terminating NDEA fellows who have not yet finished their doctorates will be continuing their studies in 1962-63. Inasmuch as a primary aim of the Title IV program is to increase the supply of college teachers, it is significant that about 255 of these terminating fellows have reported that they will be teaching full or part time in colleges in 1962-63." *Report on the National Defense Education Act, Fiscal Years 1961 and 1962,* U. S. Govt. Printing Office (Washington, D. C., 1963), p. 22.

[4] A good many institutions have initiated or expanded graduate programs without the necessary material and human resources and not much chance of getting them.

also been eligible, and there have been Title IV fellows in linguistics at Harvard, MIT, and Stanford, in area studies at Chicago, Columbia, and Michigan, and so on. Probably no great university has been without some Title IV fellows in some departments. But many more fellows have been assigned to lesser universities, or to lesser departments in great universities, and some to institutions with very meagre experience with doctoral programs.[5]

A distinguished doctoral program requires a large specialized library. It requires a group of distinguished faculty in the field of study and related fields; it is not a one-man job. It requires a tradition and an on-going program of faculty research. It takes time to build. It is most likely to be found in the context of a great university. Surely in a program of which a major purpose is to produce college teachers, fellowships should be available for study in the strongest departments of the best universities, whether or not those departments are expanding their programs.

With the new provisions of the Act they can be, although the amendments require an even larger number of future fellowships to be assigned to new or expanded programs than in the past; i.e., 1,500 to be awarded in 1965, 2,000 in 1966, and 2,500 each year thereafter.

New and expanding programs need students. Restriction of the fellowships to such programs in the past has enabled them to attract students. If some fellowships were not so restricted, few students would choose new or struggling programs in preference to established, prestigious ones. Where new programs are needed, earmarked fellowships will be needed for them.[6]

---

[5] ". . . members of the Association of Graduate Schools, which is composed of the better known graduate schools . . . , granted approximately 68 percent of the Nation's earned doctorates in 1958-59, but they received only 37 percent of the Title IV fellowships in 1959. . . . The majority of the awards have gone to newer, smaller schools." *Report on the National Defense Education Act, Fiscal Years 1961 and 1962,* p. 21.

[6] The fellowships are more important to a new or growing program than the accompanying grants of $2,500 per student. The assignment of a small group of good graduate students (say half a dozen) to a small department can be very important. The accompanying grant of $15,000 might pay the base salary of an additional professor for the three-year life expectancy of the fellowships or it might pay for a significant addition to the library, but more than that it cannot do. The fixed sum per student is more equitable, however, than grants based on varying tuition fees would be. The grants are really in lieu of tuition.

In some fields of study, however, among them some modern foreign languages, it would be well to ask whether new programs are yet needed and whether the priority should be placed upon building new facilities and expanding lesser ones or on increasing the numerical capacity of established ones. In any event, some great universities with strong modern foreign language departments could presently accommodate more doctoral candidates in the common languages, and others could do the same by the addition of faculty. The same must be true in other fields. Although these are not mutually exclusive aims, the USOE must determine the emphasis to be put in the future on multiplying graduate facilities, on strengthening weaker ones, or on "building to strength." It must decide between a first stress on building more and better graduate schools for the future or on providing the best possible graduate education for tomorrow's professors. Since the need for college teachers is immediate and the quality of future graduate schools depends on the quality of their education, it seems to me that stress on full utilization of present capacity and on the quality of the education provided should take priority over the expansion of weaker programs or the encouragement of struggling new ones. No doubt there are political considerations involved, but surely stress on geographical distribution can be overdone or interpreted in terms of unnecessarily small geographical regions.

Perhaps the very best graduate schools do not need the support of NDEA fellowships to attract excellent students. But there are also second-level schools with established programs, far ahead of some new or expanding ones, which would benefit from fellowship students and which can provide them with better educational programs than can be expected from newly established programs in smaller schools.

The establishment of new criteria for approval of programs for Title IV support is an extremely important task of the USOE. It is one to which the universities, their associations, and the several learned and professional societies might also give a good deal of attention, for it is a subject on which the USOE can use advice and will surely seek it.[7]

[7] Officers of the USOE are well aware of this problem. By the time this is published, new regulations will have been formulated and will be in effect. There will be continuing problems, however, and USOE regulations are of course subject to periodical review in the USOE, just as the Act is subject to review whenever it comes up for renewal.

Chapter Four

TEACHING EXPERIENCE FOR FUTURE TEACHERS

The legislation of October 1964 provides for the rapid expansion of the Title IV fellowship program, from 1,500 fellowships to 7,500 fellowships annually during the next two years. Unless they are guarded against, this expansion may have two undesirable results. The universities which employ teaching fellows for a considerable portion of their undergraduate teaching (in modern foreign languages, the great majority) will find not only that the best graduate students are being paid not to teach but also that there are too few second best to take their places. Three or four years hence, colleges seeking junior faculty may find many of the best new Ph.D.'s coming into the academic marketplace having served no teaching apprenticeship whatever.[8]

Present regulations allow, but do not require, some teaching. If new regulations encourage or require supervised teaching experience in the programs of Title IV fellows, and if the universities assume their responsibility, they can make an important contribution to the quality of American education. The universities need the young teachers and the graduate students will be the better for the experience.

At present few universities do provide adequately for the supervision and guidance of their teaching fellows. As a result, presidents and deans of undergraduate colleges often complain that the products of the graduate schools have no real conception of their duties as teachers and little skill in performing them.

The problems to be solved are not peculiar to the modern languages, but they are critical in the modern languages. A recent NDEA-supported report on the preparation of college teachers of modern languages observes that it would be hard to overestimate the importance of the graduate assistantship as an apprenticeship and as a source of teaching personnel for undergraduate classes. The report surveyed the language departments which have produced most of today's college teachers of modern languages and observes that most of them served their apprenticeships in those de-

[8] It does not help matters that this change is to take place during a period of almost unprecedented growth in the number of youths in the freshman and sophomore age-groups, the youths whom graduate students usually teach. During 1964, 3,700,000 young Americans reached their seventeenth birthdays —almost a million more than during 1963—*Population Profiles,* Population Reference Bureau (Washington, D. C., 7 September 1964).

partments as well. "The same source will continue to furnish most of the future college teachers by much the same process, including the assistantship. Indeed, it is practically axiomatic that wherever there is graduate work, there will be teaching assistants."[9] It may become a good deal less axiomatic under an expanded Title IV fellowship program.

The committee report deplores the widespread practice of using first-year graduate students to teach undergraduate classes as disadvantageous both to the graduate assistant and to the undergraduates he teaches. It also deplores the fact that almost 60 per cent of the language departments included in its survey report that they give their graduate students no training in teaching and that many others give very inadequate training.[10] Two years earlier Jack M. Stein had outlined a program for the preparation of college teachers of modern foreign languages which has implicit in it some suggestions for the operation of the expanded Title IV fellowship program. He proposes that no graduate student be put in charge of an undergraduate class during the first year of his graduate study and that during the first year his program should include a "training course" which would provide "an introduction to descriptive linguistics with emphasis on its relevance to second language learning; methods of teaching at all undergraduate levels; planned observation of model classes by the students; training in laboratory techniques; detailed examination of materials, including textbooks, workbooks, laboratory exercises, visual aids, and the like; and—another important thing overlooked in present graduate programs—lectures and discussions on the present state and development of the foreign language teaching profession."[11]

This having been accomplished, Stein observes that the student in his second year of graduate study will be "at least minimally prepared to assume teaching responsibilities." He warns, however, that the graduate student's employment should not be regarded primarily as a subsidy for the student nor as a source of cheap labor for the university. It should be "an introduction to teaching responsibilities, carried on under careful supervision and guidance." He spells out what should be encompassed in the supervisory program and proposes increased teaching responsibility during the third year of graduate study.

---

[9] Archibald T. MacAllister, "The Preparation of College Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages," *PMLA,* LXXIX (May 1964), 30.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Jack M. Stein, "Preparation of College and University Language Teachers," *PMLA,* LXXVI (May 1961), 13.

A plan has been under consideration in the USOE to regard the Ph.D. program of the Title IV fellow not as a three-year but as a four-year one, including supervised teaching experience. In such a program, the kind of special preparation for teaching that Stein proposes might be provided during the first two years. During the third year, the university might be expected to arrange teaching experience (perhaps half-time, perhaps full-time) and to provide the fellow's stipend. During the fourth year, the dissertation year, the student could resume his fellowship with reduced or discontinued teaching responsibility.

By whatever plan, it is important not to deprive the universities suddenly of the services of many of their potential graduate assistants and many Ph.D. candidates of the opportunity for some teaching apprenticeship. In the long run, the Title IV program will give us more college teachers. It would be unfortunate if it took away teachers, however temporarily, during a period of unprecedented growth in undergraduate enrollments. While the USOE is planning and administering new regulations for the expanded Title IV program, the universities and colleges had better do some planning, too. They had better do it together.

NDEA FELLOWSHIPS, TITLE VI

The Commissioner is authorized under Title VI

> to pay stipends to individuals undergoing advanced training in any modern foreign language . . . and other fields needed for a full understanding of the area . . . in which such language is used, at any short-term or regular session of any institution of higher education, including allowances for dependents and travel . . . , but only upon reasonable assurance that the recipients of such stipends will . . . be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an institution of higher education or for . . . other service of a public nature.

These fellowships (Title VI) differ from the others (Title IV) in several ways. They are exclusively for students who include the study of a foreign language in their educational plans. By administrative decision, they have been restricted to students of critical or neglected languages and the areas in which those languages are spoken.

Although about 90 per cent of the Title VI fellows are preparing for academic careers, their opportunity for teaching experience is even more restricted than that of Title IV fellows. They are allowed to teach not more than one-eighth of a full teaching load during one year of their tenure as fellows (in effect, one class for one semester) if this is a requirement for the doctorate in the department and university in which they are studying. It might be difficult to provide teaching duties for graduate students in some of the fields of study supported (in which there may be no undergraduates for them to teach), but the prohibition of it guarantees inadequate experience for future teachers of uncommon languages and related area studies.

Title VI fellowships are for terms of one year, one academic year, or for "short-term" sessions (e.g., summer sessions) instead of for three years, but it has been USOE policy to renew annual fellowships three times when performance has been satisfactory. The fellowships provide stipends, dependency allowances, and travel allowances, but they do not carry with them grants to the universities. They are awarded to the fellows not in terms of approved institutions or programs but in terms of the competence of the applicant and an approvable plan of study relevant to college teaching or to other approved forms of public service to which the language studied is relevant. Although preference has been given to doctoral candidates, the fellowships have not been restricted to them.

During the first five years of the program, a total of 3,320 fellowships (357 for the summer) were awarded to 2,027 individuals. They studied sixty-six different languages. During these years a total of $12,412,951 of federal funds were committed to the program.

"Advanced training," which the Act specifies, was at first interpreted to mean graduate study, even though the graduate student was beginning his study of the language in which he was awarded the fellowship. This was and remains a necessary interpretation, for in most of the languages for which Title VI fellowships have been available there is little or no opportunity for study in most undergraduate colleges. It would be unrealistic to make eligibility for a fellowship in Turkish, for example, contingent on prior study of Turkish. More recently, "advanced training" has been interpreted also to mean advanced study of the language (i.e., second year or higher), without the requirement of graduate standing, and during the summer of 1963 there were 96 undergraduate fellowships for summer study.[12] If in the future we are to have graduate students who are not beginning their study of uncommonly taught languages in graduate school, the fellowship program "should explicitly designate *undergraduates,* in addition to graduate students, as recipients of fellowships. Mastery of difficult languages like Chinese and Arabic is no task for a year or two of post-baccalaureate work crowded with other concerns."[13] Undergraduate fellowships should not be restricted to summer study.

Most of the fellowships have been awarded for study of one or another of the seven languages classified as most critical: Arabic, Chinese, Hindi-Urdu, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and American Spanish, with the largest numbers in Russian and Chinese. The rest have been scattered among 59 other uncommon or neglected languages. Among these, those with the larger numbers of fellows (20 or more) have been in Bengali, Finnish, Indonesian, Korean, Persian, Polish, Serbo-Croatian, Swahili, Thai, and Turkish. Except for Spanish, no Title VI fellowships have been awarded in the common languages.[14]

The procedure for selecting fellows in the Title VI program has been worked out with some difficulty and still results in some problems. Candidates for graduate fellowships are nominated by the universities to which they have applied and which find them acceptable to their graduate schools. The fellowships are then awarded by the Commissioner of Education on the basis of recommendations from a review committee of scholars and on the basis of priorities (and informal quotas) among the languages.

No candidate may now submit nominations from more than three universities, but multiple applications still present some difficulties. The candidate may indicate his preference among the universities to which he applies, but they also rate him as a desired candidate (A) or merely acceptable (B). Unacceptable candidates they do not nominate, of course.

---

[12] The undergraduate fellows studied thirteen uncommonly taught languages (chiefly Chinese and Japanese) at as many universities. During 1962 and 1963 summer sessions there were also some postdoctoral fellowships—primarily in Portuguese and Spanish.

[13] William R. Parker, *The National Interest and Foreign Languages,* pp. 16-17.

[14] The seven most critical languages have claimed 72.9 per cent of the fellowships. Of these, 45 per cent (1,151 fellowships) have been divided between Russian and Chinese. The remaining 27.9 per cent (708 fellowships) have been divided among the other 59 languages.

What are the reviewers of applications to recommend and what is the USOE to do when a candidate's first-choice institution rates him "B" and his second choice rates him "A"? What are they to recommend if three institutions rate him "A" and his first choice is thought to be significantly weaker than the others in the field in which he wishes to study? What is the candidate to think if he is notified that he has been awarded a fellowship at his second- or third-choice institution? What does his first-choice university think? It thinks the committee and the USOE are diverting students from its program, which is true.

They are diverting students. I think they should. The evaluators and the Fellowship Section of USOE have a difficult policy decision to make. Is the primary object to provide the best language and area education available to the student, or is it to strengthen language and area programs, or to spread the wealth of students among them? Should preference be given to NDEA-supported centers, or should students be shared among the NDEA haves and non-NDEA have-nots? Is there in effect an obligation to "counsel" the student to go to the best program available by assigning him to that program?

The review committee has sometimes taken the view that it has this indirect counseling function, but its assignment of a fellowship to study at a given university is not a simple judgment of the quality of that institution or of its language program. No two language and area programs are alike, even though they deal with the same language and the same area. The differences are not qualitative in any simple sense. Among the criteria for the award of fellowships is the applicant's statement of purpose. Fellowships may be given only to candidates who intend to enter occupations judged important by the Commissioner: higher education, government, international organizations of which the United States is a member (e.g., the United Nations) or certain international charitable organizations (e.g., the Red Cross). Of course the projected career must be one to which language competence is relevant, and the candidate is required to submit a plan of studies, including his area studies. On the basis of this plan, and with some attention to the candidate's preference, the committee may decide that the University of Winnemac is a more appropriate place for him to study than the University of Orrington. Experts in fields like critical and neglected languages are likely to know what is going on in other institutions than their own, and even if Professor Cedilla and Professor Schwa do not agree on any exact hierarchy of institutions, they are likely to agree on the identification of any really inappropriate institution. I do not see how the USOE and its review committee can evade the responsibility for that judgment. If the need is for people expert in neglected languages and the areas in which those languages are spoken, students should be sent where they have the best chance to become expert.

Allocation of fellowships among the many languages is a different matter. Informal quotas have been established for different languages or have established themselves in terms of the number and quality of applicants as well as in terms of priorities among languages. The ratio of applicants to vacancies is much higher in some languages (e.g., Spanish, Russian, Chinese) than in others (e.g., Thai or Turkish). The result is a double standard. No candidate is accepted unless he is rated "A" or "B," but "A" or "B" candidates who would be acceptable in some languages become alternates or must be rejected outright if they apply in the commoner critical languages, for which there is an excess of applicants.

The difference is not only in the intellectual capacity of the candidates, but also in their prior education. In Spanish, for example, fellowships are not awarded to persons who have not previously studied the language. In Russian it would now be practicable to award the fellowships available only to applicants who have previously studied the language. In Thai or Turkish prior study is unlikely. Since the object is to encourage the study of uncommonly taught languages, the USOE has no alternative to the establishment of informal quotas. In the long run, award of undergraduate fellowships in neglected languages might provide more and better applicants.

Although Title VI fellowships may be granted for a "short-term" program, for an academic year, or for a calendar year, it is the policy to renew those based on the academic year if the holders are making satisfactory progress toward the doctorate. The fellowships are not renewed more than three times, however. The object is to support the candidate who seeks the doctorate until he achieves it or is near it. Since fellowship holders are full-time students, it is expected that the degree will be completed or nearly completed in four years. It often takes longer in the more difficult languages, however, especially if the study of the language is first undertaken at the graduate level, which in unusual and neglected languages it often must be. Some fellows have had their opportunity for supported study extended by Fulbright-Hays scholarships, now also administered by the USOE.

The policy of renewable fellowships is surely sound. The young scholar encouraged by financial aid to begin work toward the doctorate in a language designated as important to the national interest should not be cut off in the middle of his program. On the other hand, such support should not be endless, and the policy of limiting fellowships to a tenure of four years also seems sound. It is the obligation of the universities to devise doctoral programs that can be completed by able and conscientious students in four years or not much more. In the more difficult languages, intensive summer programs have been found valuable, and NDEA support of such summer programs should surely be continued and perhaps expanded. Fellowships (as has been noted) are sometimes awarded on a twelve-month basis or may be supplemented by summer fellowships, so that fellows can take advantage of these intensive summer programs. But doctoral programs which cannot be completed in three or at most four calendar years by able and industrious full-time students, aided by such special opportunities as the summer workshops, are inexcusable. The USOE cannot prescribe the content or the duration of a Ph.D. program, but it can and should continue to limit the fellowships to four years. The obligation to plan reasonable doctoral programs rests with the universities.

The policy of renewing fellowships for satisfactory students cuts down the input and will do so until more fellows begin to emerge from the program with their degrees. This is a further reason for limiting the fellowship period. So far, very few doctorates have been completed under the fellowship program, but the current academic year (1964-65) should see a good many of the first group. Already there have been a good many master's degrees and a good many fellows have reached the point sometimes called "the A.B.D. degree"—all but the dissertation, which need not be completed in residence.[15]

---

[15] In the Title VI Fellowship Program from 1959 until April of 1964 there are 158 M.A.'s on record (on the basis of incomplete statistics). Out of 865 fellows in Title VI, 175 have completed course work for the Ph.D. and are engaged in dissertation research.

There has been no employment placement problem as yet, since there have been few products. As a possible future problem, it should be a matter of concern, however. It is one thing to make the judgment that the national interest requires a supply of scholars expert in Arabic and Annamese and Turkish and Thai. It is another thing to be sure that there will be appropriate professional employment during the next few years for considerable numbers of Ph.D.'s in such languages. There should be frequent, recurrent follow-up studies of the employment experience of former fellows and of the relevance of their study to their occupations. The support of such studies would be an appropriate use of NDEA funds.[16]

TRAVEL GRANTS AND LOANS

There is one serious omission from NDEA provisions for fellowships for students and teachers of foreign languages. There is no provision for travel and study overseas.[17] Yet residence or travel or study abroad is an important part of the education of a teacher or scholar of foreign languages. Too few have the opportunity for it.

Travel grants should of course be for travel in the region where the language taught is spoken. They should be available only to teachers and graduate students with a working competence in the language. Although periodic residence abroad is important to language teachers, the first object should be to give the opportunity to as many as possible. It would therefore be well not to award more than one special travel grant per person, or (after the Fulbright-Hays precedent) not to award a second grant within five years. With or without these qualifications, there should be added to NDEA some provisions for grants in aid and loans for high school and college teachers and for graduate students who intend to teach modern foreign languages and who submit approvable plans for study abroad. Loans for this purpose might well be forgivable on the same basis as present NDEA loans for college students. Provisions have been made recently that allow modern foreign language teachers to deduct from their taxable income the expenses incurred in traveling to and residing in countries whose languages they teach. This is the least that could be done. It is a genuine professional expense.

---

[16] The same recommendation applies to students in the NDEA Centers Program, whether or not they are NDEA fellows.

[17] There are exceptions to this general statement. Title VI fellows may study overseas while writing doctoral dissertations if their graduate deans certify that foreign study is essential to the completion of the dissertation, and fellows may study in overseas branches of American universities. But there are no allowances for travel and these are exceptional, not general, provisions. There is also a kind of exception in the Institute Program, for there are a few "second level" institutes abroad each summer; but institute participants are not regarded as holding fellowships and do not include prospective college teachers. Finally, it is true that some fellows have had the opportunity for extended support and for overseas study because they have received Fulbright grants. The program of the USOE Bureau of International Education also provides opportunity for some teachers to study abroad.

With reference to non-Western languages, the omission of provision for foreign study has been largely corrected by other legislation. Between 1950 and 1963, under Fulbright-Hays and other earlier acts, 2,073 American students, lecturers, research scholars, and others went to the Far East, 258 to Africa, 1,850 to the Near East and South Asia, and 1,425 to Latin America. In 1961, the Fulbright-Hays Act included two provisions important in this area. It authorized special "educational and cultural projects" abroad, and resulting grants have been made to the American Research Center in Egypt, and to the American Association for Middle East Studies. These grants have enabled American scholars and advanced students to study in India, Egypt, and Israel. The Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961 also authorizes the promotion of

> modern foreign language training and area studies in United States schools, colleges, and universities by supporting visits and study in foreign countries by teachers and prospective teachers in such schools, colleges, and universities for the purpose of improving their skill in languages and their knowledge of the culture of the people of those countries, and by financing visits by teachers from those countries to the United States for the purpose of participating in foreign language training and area studies in United States schools, colleges, and universities.[18]

This program is administered by the USOE, and the first USOE awards were for the summer of 1964 and the academic year 1964-65. Eighty graduate students studying to become college teachers of non-Western languages and area studies and 40 faculty members of NDEA-supported language and area centers received these first grants, at a cost of $914,400. There have been no grants as yet to bring foreign visitors to this country to join the faculties of the language and area centers.[19]

---

[18] Fulbright-Hays Act, Section 102 (b) (6). There is a fuller account of this program in Kenneth W. Mildenberger, "The Federal Government and the Universities," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, November 1964, pp. 23-29.

There remain to be provided similar opportunities for much larger numbers of scholars, teachers, and graduate students in the common languages.

[19] Mildenberger, pp. 23-29.

V

NDEA Language and Area Centers

There were a few area and language programs before World War II, but the NDEA-supported centers have their origin chiefly in programs developed for the armed forces during the war. "United States military forces needed many personnel with working knowledge of the languages and cultures of the countries and areas of the world where combat and occupation forces were expected to operate."[1]

Of the several area and language programs conducted or contracted for by the armed forces, the largest and perhaps most widely known was the Foreign Area and Language Studies of the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP).[2] Aside from whatever importance it had in the war effort, this program had long-range educational significance. It began with the advice and drew on the experience of the Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies.[3] It helped to develop and it tested in practice, on a large scale, a new method of teaching foreign languages, using native informants and extensive drill and putting its emphasis upon mastery of the spoken word. Primarily in the teaching of uncommon languages, but in some universities also in the common languages, it was "the first major application of the science of linguistics to language teaching."[4]

---

[1] Kenneth W. Mildenberger, "The Federal Government and the Universities," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, November 1964, p. 24.

[2] See Robert J. Matthew, *Language and Area Studies in the Armed Services*, American Council on Education (Washington, D. C., 1947), and Joseph Axelrod and Donald N. Bigelow, *Resources for Language and Area Studies*, American Council on Education (Washington, D. C., 1962).

[3] The ACLS Intensive Language Program and the ASTP and other military programs based on it resulted largely from the foresight and initiative of Mortimer Graves of the ACLS, J Milton Cowan, Director of its Intensive Language Program, and David Stevens and John Marshall of the Rockefeller Foundation. The area components of the military programs were largely the invention of Charles Hyneman, who served as consultant to the Director of the Army Specialized Training Division, as did J Milton Cowan. The

In addition to fostering the audio-lingual approach to language teaching, the ASTP Area and Language Program introduced into American universities a number of languages that had not been taught in this country.[5] The War Department contracted for the development of teaching materials in many of them—materials (some of which are still in use) that are the direct ancestors of others since developed under foundation support or with NDEA funds.

The ASTP program combined language teaching with instruction in the culture of the area in which the language was spoken. In effect it substituted an interdisciplinary social science orientation for the traditional literary emphasis in language instruction,

---

writer of this report was successively Chief of the Language Training Section, Historical Officer, and Executive Officer, Curriculum Branch, of the Army Specialized Training Division, Hq. ASF.

[4] Axelrod and Bigelow, p. 8. The final version of the ASTP Foreign Area and Language Curriculum required fifteen hours a week of language instruction. It recommended the following breakdown: one-hour demonstrations, three times a week, by the senior instructor, on the structure of the language; two-hour drill sessions, six days a week, by a colloquial speaker of the language, preferably native-born, supervised by the senior instructor "to assure that it is keyed to the demonstrations on structure." Drill sections were limited to ten students. "As far as practicable, men studying the same language should be housed and messed together and otherwise encouraged to talk the language they are studying." "The objective of the language instruction is to impart to the trainee a command of the colloquial *spoken* language. This command includes the ability to speak the language fluently, accurately, and with an acceptable approximation to a native pronunciation. It also implies that the student will have practically perfect auditory comprehension of the language as spoken by natives." Army Specialized Training Program, *Advanced Phase Curriculum No. 71, Foreign Area and Language Studies,* War Dept. (Washington, D. C., 27 October 1953).

[5] In response to specific requests from agencies of the armed forces, contracts were negotiated for instruction in the following languages: Arabic (Syrian), Arabic (Moroccan), Bulgarian, Czech, Dutch, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Norwegian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish, Annamese, Bengali, Burmese, Chinese (Foochow), Chinese (Fukien), Chinese (Mandarin), Hindustani, Japanese, Korean, Malayan, Thai.

although not to the exclusion of literature as a means of understanding the culture. The shift was justified in terms of the different objectives of instruction in languages for soldiers in time of war, when the object was not the understanding and appreciation of literature but the soldier's usefulness and survival in the area in which the language is spoken.[6]

The program created a good deal of interest among professors of foreign languages and some controversy over the audio-lingual approach and area content. Sponsored by the War Department, it constituted a War Department statement of the value of language competence to the national defense. Consequently it was an important precedent (and a widely publicized one) for the inclusion of languages among the disciplines to be supported under a National *Defense* Education Act.

When the war ended, the wartime area and language programs shrank or disappeared, but the concepts of intensive language education and of interdisciplinary study of the culture of an area remained. Gradually, a good many universities reinstated or revitalized their area studies programs, often with foundation support.[7]

---

[6] See John S. Diekhoff, "The Mission and the Method of Army Language Teaching," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Winter 1945, pp. 606-620. ASTP Curriculum No. 71 provided three area study checklists: geographical, historical, and "Contemporary Institutions and Culture." Under the last heading were such items as the following: state of public health and sanitation; epidemic diseases (particularly those of military significance, such as venereal disease, typhus, malaria, etc.); social conventions in relation to the control of disease; food and drink habits; types of dress and relation to climate; folk ways; taboos and conventions (particularly those bearing on religion or family and sexual relationships); social status groups and caste systems (with special emphasis on those stratifications of society inimical to each other); revolutionary or 'underground' movements. The checklists in history and geography are rather more academically conventional, but "every effort must be made to avoid 'warming over' conventional social science courses and offering them under the guise of Area Study . . . New methods of instruction and teaching materials must be devised to meet the objectives which are entailed in the Area Study curriculum."

[7] The magnitude of NDEA support for language education has sometimes obscured the importance of foundation support, especially for education in uncommonly taught languages. For accounts of foundation activities, see Robert S. Morison, "Foundations and the Universities," *Daedalus*, Fall 1964; George M. Beckman, "The Role of the Foundations," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, November 1964; Axelrod and Bigelow, Ch. i; and *Language Doors*, Ford Foundation, 1964. Foundation support of education in uncommonly taught languages has not ceased with

Typically, the area studies programs of this period put less stress on language instruction than the ASTP programs or the programs of present NDEA-supported centers. They were area programs, primarily.[8] At least two of the leading area studies programs included no language study at all.

Language and area centers, as described by the USOE, have the following essential characteristics: they deal with a clearly defined global area, give attention to both language and related area study, include study of both humanities and social sciences, have interrelated programs of research and instruction, have adequate libraries in the language materials relevant to the area, and have assurance of long-term institutional backing.[9] By 1951 there were 29 such "integrated Area Programs" in the graduate schools of 19 universities, including four programs dealing with European areas, and 22 "potential" or developing programs, of which three were European.[10]

There were language and area programs, then, before NDEA, and there were centers. But resources for the study of many important languages were nonexistent or inadequate. In 1956 a policy statement of the Modern Language Association Foreign Language Program recommended "establishment of *centers of instruction* in colleges and universities in various parts of the country, each one specializing in a single group of languages spoken by millions of people but practically unknown to us. It would be desirable also to make available in each center instruction in the geography, history, economics, and politics of the language area stu-

---

the advent of NDEA. For example, foundation grants have helped more than one university building language and area centers to meet the NDEA matching funds requirement.

[8] Periodic inventories of facilities for area studies were published by the State Department in 1954, 1956, 1959, and 1962. It is surely significant that the first three were entitled *Area Study Programs in American Universities.* In the 1962 edition the title is changed to *Language and Area Study Programs in American Universities.*

[9] Donald N. Bigelow and Lyman H. Legters, *NDEA Language and Area Centers, A Report on the First 5 Years,* U. S. Govt. Printing Office (Washington, D. C., 1964), p. 13. The "essential characteristics" are from a USOE memorandum of 1 December 1959, reprinted in Appendix A of Bigelow and Legters. See also *Language and Area Studies in American Universities,* U. S. Dept. of State (Washington, D.C., 1962).

[10] Wendell C. Bennett, *Area Studies in American Universities,* Social Science Research Council (New York, 1951), p. 10.

died. It is essential and urgent *educational planning,* regional and national, that we call for . . ."[11]

Since World War II the role of the United States in the world has involved almost every government agency in international affairs. The universities are also involved, Mildenberger reminds us:

> Junior and staff personnel are recruited from the campus. Wisdom and knowledge are borrowed in the form of members of advisory committees and consultant panels. Professors are sought to go to Africa and Asia to develop a school program in English as a foreign language, to teach American studies, or to advise on an irrigation project. The Peace Corps offers contracts for short-term instructional programs for volunteers and for supervisory services abroad. The Agency for International Development contracts for the furnishing of technical assistance to developing nations. A detailed catalogue of government-university relations in the non-Western field would be large indeed.[12]

By the mid-1950's, Mildenberger observes, people in government as well as people in the universities began to realize that resources for non-Western studies in American universities were inadequate to meet present and future national needs. On the precedent of federal programs of support in a variety of fields, the United States Office of Education undertook to prepare legislation. By 1957 a draft of a bill to support language studies had been drawn. Revised, it became an important part of Title VI of NDEA, enacted in 1958.

GRADUATE CENTERS FOR LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDY

The relevant portion of the Act authorizes the Commissioner of Education

> to arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them . . . of centers for the teaching of any modern foreign language [in which] adequate instruction . . . is not readily available in the United States. Any such contract may provide for instruction not only in such modern foreign language but also in other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such language is commonly used . . . including fields such as history, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography, and anthropology. Any such contract may cover not more than 50 per centum of the cost of the establishment and operation of the center.

---

[11] "FL Program Policy," *PMLA,* LXXI (Sept. 1956, Pt. 2), xxii.

[12] Mildenberger, "The Federal Government and the Universities," p. 24.

Contracts with 19 centers were announced in June 1959 for the academic year 1959-60. During the academic year 1963-64,

> Through contracts providing up to 50 per cent of federal support for new and expanded activities, 34 higher learning institutions have strengthened instruction in 55 centers—East Asia, 11 centers; Slavic and East Europe, 10; Middle East, 8; South Asia, 7; Latin America, 7; Sub-Saharan Africa, 5; Southeast Asia, 3; Uralic-Altaic regions, 2; Asian-Slavic, 2. Federal funds may be used for instructional salaries, acquisition and servicing of library materials, conferences, and travel. About half the financial support has implemented area studies instruction. The number of teachers of non-Western languages at the centers has increased from under 80 to over 200, and the number of languages taught has risen from 20 to 76. Enrollments have more than trebled. Some 20 centers annually offer summer programs in intensive language study, usually equivalent to a full year's course work.[13]

The Act authorized the Commissioner to "arrange through contracts . . . for the establishment and operation" of centers. The word "establishment" raised an important policy question at the very beginning of the NDEA Language Development Program. If it meant "bringing into existence," support could be given only to institutions initiating new centers. If it also meant "make stable, firm, and secure," the primary etymological meaning of the word, it authorized support for existing centers. Parker and Mildenberger, who were administering the program, held "not only that 'establishment' meant *both* these things, but also that, in the initial stages of the program, it had better mean the recognition and strengthening and expansion of Centers already created, for the alternative was to neglect or even penalize pioneer efforts, contributing federal funds for the 'raiding' of academic departments that had actually anticipated the intention of Congress."[14] When the first contracts were negotiated, it became clear that "establish" had been interpreted to mean both things. New centers could be brought into existence and existing ones could be strengthened and expanded. Among the first centers "established"—indeed, the first two with which contracts were negotiated—were the already distinguished Near Eastern Center at Princeton and the equally distinguished South Asian Center at Pennsylvania. Neither had taken the initiative in seeking a contract because they had assumed the narrower interpretation of the word "established."

---

[13] Ibid., p. 27.

[14] William R. Parker, "The First Year of the Language Development Program," unpublished MS, by the first director of the program.

Since 1959, the USOE has stressed the multiplication and expansion of facilities equally with the "recognition and strengthening" of existing ones. Centers supported have grown in number from 19 to 55. "Increasing numbers of non-NDEA language and area programs had appeared across the academic map by 1963-64, constituting a large potential clientele for Federal support in the event that larger resources should become available."[15] The USOE has also been concerned for the geographical distribution of centers: "Geographical distribution of centers through the various regions of the United States was achieved only in the early part of 1962 by the designation of new Latin American centers, some of which were located in previously unrepresented Southern States."[16]

The Centers Program undertakes to do several things, but its overriding purpose is to encourage the study of critical and neglected languages and the areas in which they are spoken. It is closely related to the Research Program and to the Fellowship Program, for the study of uncommon languages depends not only on university facilities (faculty, library, etc.), but also on the availability of teaching materials and of students. Instructional materials for many of the seventy-some languages taught in the centers were not available in 1958, or were not adequate. Many have been produced under NDEA research contracts. Faculties of the centers have been active in producing them: some 50 people associated with the centers have undertaken about 70 research projects.[17] And about 70 per cent of the NDEA Title VI fellows have studied at the centers. The centers do the research, receive the students, do the teaching.

The first emphasis in the Centers Program has been on graduate education, because most existing programs were graduate and because graduate education promised early returns in teachers for undergraduate courses and experts for other employment.[18] Although all the centers teach undergraduates, often more undergraduates than graduate students, all but four are graduate centers.

---

[15] Bigelow and Legters, p. 38.

[16] Ibid. Clearly there are political considerations as well as educational ones underlying the concern for regional distribution of centers; otherwise it is difficult to understand the reason for Table 2 in Appendix E of the 5-year report: "Amount of Federal support to NDEA language and area centers, by State . . ." There is a fellowship program to enable students to go where programs are.

[17] Bigelow and Legters, p. 42.

[18] Ibid., p. 19.

Concentration on fewer graduate centers could have achieved greater strength, and with reference to graduate centers, the dollar-for-dollar matching requirement might be reexamined. Graduate programs are expensive, and indefinite expansion of them when there are few students is beyond the means of most universities, and when matching funds are required they cannot always afford to accept assistance.[19]

It would be a mistake to limit NDEA support in any important curriculum area to a single institution. Educational monopolies are as dangerous as any other monoply. It is important, therefore, that there be at least two centers for the advanced study of any important area and the language or languages indigenous to it. But a distinguished center can concern itself with larger areas and with more languages than some present centers do, and to good advantage. On the other hand, for some areas and languages there are more NDEA-supported centers than can possibly be called distinguished.

> Some of the language and area centers are doing excellent work, but much of it tends to be elementary. It will take special and continuing support to build even the most promising into anything resembling the London School of Oriental Studies. The materials produced for teaching the exotic languages tend to be rudimentary audio-lingual, and the research tends to be psychologically and anthropologically oriented. UNESCO officials and American leaders assert constantly that the present East-West conflict is really a battle for men's minds and that the human aspect of international development is as important as the technical. Yet only the smallest fraction of NDEA research funds has been devoted to studying or developing materials for strengthening the cultural and humanistic dimensions of language teaching.[20]

Bigelow and Legters cite the proposal of one center director that "centers of high specialization and great resources" should cooperate, in regional groupings, with smaller centers. They also cite his observation that a small center "need not feel it necessary to be exactly like a big one."[21] This is advice that may well be heeded by universities and by their language and area faculties when they are tempted by the prestige of non-Western language and area programs to undertake expansion beyond their capacity for quality. It may well be heeded also by the USOE in its consideration of applications for language and area center contracts.

---

[19] The director of Stanford's Chinese-Japanese Center reported that "The University's contribution has been growing even faster than the Government's and is now more than five times the amount the Office of Education contributes to the center." (Bigelow and Legters, p. 29.)

[20] John H. Fisher, "Needed Legislation in Support of Modern-Foreign-Language Teaching," unpublished memorandum for the President's Advisory Committee on Education, August 1964.

The number of centers is not a matter of money alone. It is a matter of people. A concentration of scholars has more strength than the same scholars widely scattered. The supply of scholars in "neglected" languages is limited by definition: it is the lack of scholars that makes them neglected. The supply of area experts is also limited. There are not many students in neglected languages; in some languages there perhaps never will be. But areas merge with one another and their languages are often related to one another. Expertness in the several social sciences may be relevant to more than one local area. Designation of larger world regions and concentration of graduate language and area centers dealing with those larger regions in fewer institutions could have great advantages in terms of the quality of the centers: their scholarship; the breadth of their programs; the quality of their teaching; their financial stability. With adequate, concentrated support, we can develop a few truly distinguished centers, strategically located in great universities.

Even this objective will take time, a long time. To build a great specialized library, a team of distinguished scholars, and an institutional tradition of scholarship in a specialized field takes time. In Academia it takes time to spend money wisely. The Centers Program should by no means be regarded as a hasty crash program but as a growing, long-range one.

UNDERGRADUATE STUDY OF UNCOMMON AND CRITICAL LANGUAGES

Although too rapid multiplication of graduate centers is questionable, there is room for encouragement of undergraduate programs in some critical languages, and these programs need not be confined to the universities with elaborate centers. Russian, Chinese, Japanese, and Portuguese are already finding their way into more and more colleges. It is a development to be encouraged. If there are to be meaningful graduate programs for the preparation

[21] Bigelow and Legters, p. 39.

of experts in these languages and the relevant areas, it will be advantageous to have widespread undergraduate programs as a base for recruitment. NDEA fellowships for undergraduates would help. Few undergraduates will have any preparation in the really uncommon languages, and those few will be in the universities that have graduate centers. But in the commoner critical languages undergraduate enrollment is growing and is not restricted to institutions having centers.

Students are the prime requisite for an undergraduate program. An undergraduate program needs faculty, books, materials, and other facilities, of course; but a respectable undergraduate program does not need the kind of support nor the kind of concentration of expertness that is required for distinguished graduate centers. Graduate centers in large institutions of course will have the strongest and largest undergraduate programs. But they will not have a monopoly on the commoner critical languages.

Undergraduate study of uncommon languages is already growing. Although almost all the centers enroll graduate students, all of them enroll undergraduates. In 1962 more than 60 per cent of the enrollments in the courses in NDEA centers were undergraduates. Partly as a means of encouraging undergraduate study of critical and neglected languages, and partly to speed up the language competence of graduate students, the USOE has supported special intensive language programs during summer sessions at more than twenty centers and has made fellowships for study in them available to undergraduates. During the summer of 1963 about a hundred undergraduate fellows attended the summer programs. Several hundred other undergraduates also studied in them without fellowships. And 14 faculty members of liberal arts colleges were awarded post-doctoral fellowships for intensive summer language study—also as a means of encouraging expansion of non-Western studies in undergraduate colleges.

The summer programs of 1962 and 1964 have been evaluated under NDEA contracts.[22] The reports are agreed that it is important to continue support of summer intensive language programs. They also discuss measures to be taken by the universities to improve them. The 1964 report urges particularly the wholehearted adoption of the audio-lingual approach by those universities which have not committed themselves to it: ". . . the survey was astonished to find that with only a few exceptions the NDEA-sponsored language courses as observed in the summer of 1964 had virtually abandoned the audio-lingual method. Nothing could be found of it in most of the Centers visited except the terminology—words like linguist, native informant, drill master and drill section were found in abundant use. But the functions properly associated with these terms have generally been lost sight of."[23]

---

[22] See Bigelow and Legters, Appendix C, for the evaluation of the 1962 program. For the 1964 evaluation, see Roy Andrew Miller, "A Survey of Intensive Programs in Uncommon Languages, Summer 1964," Inst. of Far Eastern Studies, Yale Univ. (New Haven, Conn., 1964), mimeographed.

One of the reasons for this development, the report suggests, is the serious shortage of people with linguistic training. The report also makes the interesting observation that there seemed to be "some direct relationship between the size of a field of study, the number of students studying the language, its extent of permeation into the American academic curriculum and other such factors with whether or not the audio-lingual method was honored in fact or merely in name." The uncommon African languages and some South and Southeast Asian languages are cited as fields in which the audio-lingual method is employed "with imagination, energy, and success."

The summer intensive language instruction has been the only part of the Centers Program that has been subjected to evaluation by outside agencies under contract, and it is now the policy of the USOE to make awards of future contracts for summer intensive programs "competitive," on the basis of repeated evaluations. With reference to the centers themselves, however, it has been USOE policy to renew contracts if the universities desire the renewal. Nevertheless, reports on the centers made by USOE personnel and consultants indicate a considerable range in quality, as do the evaluations of the summer programs.

Of course support once tendered should not be abruptly withdrawn. That institutions should be dependent on annual action and must trust in informal assurances of continued support (contingent on renewed appropriations) makes long-range planning too difficult as it is. Contracts for longer terms would be preferable to the current practice of renewable annual contracts. But renewed support at the termination of any contract should be contingent on demonstrated strength and improvement. The USOE would be wise, surely, to contract for periodic, systematic evaluation of the centers. The resulting evaluations should be considered in the renewal of contracts for centers as similar evaluations are used in the award of repeat contracts for summer institutes.

---

[23] Roy Andrew Miller, pp. 26-27.

AREA STUDY IN COMMON LANGUAGES

Parker quotes Nicholas Murray Butler's 1918 annual report as President of Columbia University: "The chief purpose in studying French should be to gain an understanding and appreciation of France"[24] and refers to Butler's suggestion of a Department of Latin Peoples instead of a Department of Romance Languages and Literatures. And in 1953 Hayward Keniston, past president of the MLA, observed that "language study in the past has been oriented almost exclusively toward literature. It must now reorient itself toward the total culture of the people, which would of course include literature."[25]

In spite of these recommendations, in spite of War Department insistence on area study in World War II programs, and in spite of growing emphasis on general culture in some recent college and secondary school texts, the area-study concept has not made much headway in the common languages in our colleges and universities. "No one hesitates to offer over-all studies of the complex Far East or Southern Asia, but everyone resists doing the same for Europe."[26]

Surely understanding of the areas in which common languages are spoken is as important as understanding of areas in which uncommon languages are common. We have more knowledge of such areas, of course, and more adequate materials for teaching about them. But except for American Spanish and except for Russian, there are no NDEA language and area centers devoted to the common languages. Of course it is possible to study not only the languages of Europe but also the history, economy, and government of the countries in which they are spoken in any good university. But a language and area center is, or can be, an agency planned and staffed to explore and to teach a culture by a variety of coordinated approaches and in a way that does indeed shift the emphasis from the humane to the social sciences. It is an approach that has its place.

---

[24] William R. Parker, *The National Interest and Foreign Languages*, p. 80.

[25] In an unpublished address, quoted from Elton Hocking, *Language Laboratory and Language Learning*, Dept. of Audiovisual Instruction, National Education Association (Washington, D. C., 1964), p. 86.

[26] Wendell C. Bennett, p. 34.

I do not suggest that professors of commonly taught modern foreign languages turn their backs upon their tradition of humane scholarship and become social scientists. But a growing complementary approach to language education deserves their attention. The statement that the appropriate subject matter for a [secondary school] foreign language course "is material which reveals the foreign culture" would not be universally accepted without qualification, but the extent to which traditional literary emphasis should give way to new emphasis on the social sciences is being debated right now. And a shift in emphasis is taking place, especially in the lower schools. Teachers who will teach languages against the background of their areas should have an opportunity to study them against that background. Surely some universities, then, should shape some of their teaching and research accordingly. Language and area centers in the common languages should be made eligible for NDEA support, and initiation of one or two such centers should be considered. It would be best to place them in large universities with large numbers of students preparing to teach in secondary schools. But the value of the centers would go far beyond their immediate contribution to the education of their own students planning to be teachers. Materials for the study of the culture of their language area have not been easily available to teachers in the summer institute program. The Research Section of the USOE has been unable to find interested and qualified scholars willing to accept contracts for the development of such materials. But part of the scholarly business of an interdisciplinary language and area center would be to undertake the kind of research that must underlie the preparation of such materials. Its secondary research activities might produce the materials themselves. If the best way to teach an uncommon language is against the background of its culture, and if there has been fruitful interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching in the areas in which uncommon languages are spoken, a similar approach to the study of the common languages and their cultures may make its contribution to language education and its goals. The "battle for men's minds" to which Fisher's memorandum refers does not take place in exotic languages alone nor only in the areas in which they are spoken.[27]

---

[27] See n. 20.

VI

Institutes and Teacher Education

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 made specific provisions for teacher training institutes:

> There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $7,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the six succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through contracts with institutions of higher education, for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced training, particularly in the use of new methods and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training of teachers, of any modern foreign language in elementary or secondary schools.

A summer institute is contracted for on the basis of a proposal submitted by a college or university the fall before the institute is to be conducted. The proposal is evaluated by the Language Institute Section of the United States Office of Education, with the advice of a board of ten or twelve consultants (elementary and secondary school language teachers, college professors, and state supervisors of foreign languages). The USOE tries to anticipate demand by languages and by grade level and encourages requests for contracts for a variety of special institutes for which it sees a need. It also gives attention to the geographical distribution of institutes and to regional needs for them.

AN INSTITUTE CURRICULUM

The manual for participating institutions specifies that the curriculum of an institute

> should comprise work which will enable the institute participant to make measurable improvement in listening comprehension, speaking, reading, writing, language analysis, knowledge of the culture reflected by the target language, and professional preparation.
>
> Ample consideration should be given to classroom implications of applied linguistic principles, to discussions and readings which will give participants

an enlightened understanding of the foreign people and their culture, and to such professional training as will enable them to evaluate and use effectively new methods and techniques of language teaching. Throughout the institute the particular problems of teaching modern foreign languages in elementary and secondary schools should be kept in mind, and the work should be directed toward meeting those problems rather than placed on a theoretical plane.[1]

The following is a fairly typical daily class schedule for an eight-week summer institute in French:

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
6:50	Breakfast				
7:30-8:20	Linguistics	Free Period		Linguistics	
8:25-9:15	Demonstration Class				
9:20-10:10	Methodology		Director-Participants Meeting	Methodology	
10:10-10:20	Intermission				
10:20-11:10	Lab Practice	Lab Techniques	Lab Practice		
11:15-12:05	Culture				
12:15-1:00	Lunch and Conversation				
1:30-2:20	Pattern Practice or Conversation				
2:25-3:15	Pattern Practice or Conversation				
3:15-3:25	Intermission				

---

[1] *National Defense Language Institute Program,* A Manual for Participating Institutions, NDEA, Title VI, U. S. Govt. Printing Office (Washington, D. C., 1964), p. 4.

3:25-4:15	Reading-Writing Clinic	Lab Practice	Reading-Writing Clinic	Lab or Free	Reading-Writing Clinic
6:00-6:45	Dinner and Conversation				
7:30	Evening programs when scheduled—usually two nights per week				

The objectives of this institute are stated as follows:

1. To increase the participants' audio-lingual proficiency in the foreign language.
2. To give the participants a more thorough knowledge and a deeper appreciation of the general culture of the country whose language they are studying.
3. To show the participants how linguistics can have practical value in teaching.
4. To show the value of the language laboratory and other audio-visual equipment in language instruction and to give practical demonstrations of their uses.
5. To acquaint the participants with the new teaching methods and materials.
6. To arrange for the participants to observe a demonstration class of high school pupils taught daily through the audio-lingual approach [and] the materials now known as *A-LM*.
7. To give the participants in a reading and writing clinic class a chance to develop their reading and writing ability.
8. To prove clearly to the participants the need for more masterful teaching in secondary schools in order to help them awaken in their students a greater desire to learn languages more thoroughly.

A summer institute is no vacation. The proposal from which this class schedule and this statement of objectives are taken observes that "the formal class schedule has accounted for about 30 hours per week. This does not include mealtime conversation, films, lectures, singing sessions, extra time spent in the lab, weekend or recreational activity."

SCOPE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE INSTITUTES

There are now almost 20,000 graduates of such programs. The Institute Section, USOE, reports that during the first five years of the program, there were 301 institutes with combined enrollments of 15,617, at a cost of $25,897,049. Of these institutes, 276, with enrollments of 15,051, were short-term summer institutes; the rest were conducted during the regular academic year. Institutes for secondary school teachers enrolled 13,398 people; institutes for elementary school teachers enrolled 2,219.

Since 1960, the program has also supported higher level institutes, most of them overseas, for advanced training in the several skills necessary to a foreign language teacher. During the years 1960-63, 27 such institutes had combined enrollments of 1,766 people, 1,527 in overseas institutes. Since the higher level institutes are open only to teachers who have previously studied at first-level institutes, these 1,766 participants have received more than one summer's NDEA training in the language they teach. In addition to the foreign language institutes, there have also been institutes for teachers of English as a second language, for which authorization was given in a 1963 amendment of the Act.

The Institute Program has emphasized the most commonly taught languages—notably French and Spanish. There have been institutes in eight modern foreign languages taught in secondary schools, however, with enrollments as follows during the years 1959-63:

Language	*Enrollment*
French	6,399
Spanish	6,275
German	1,842
Russian	827
Italian	93
Chinese	92
Hebrew	69
Japanese	20
Total	15,617

During the summer of 1964, institutes were conducted in six of these languages for more than 4,000 teachers, and there were two pilot institutes for 108 teachers of English as a second language.

The USOE issued contracts for the systematic evaluation of the institutes. In the course of the evaluation, the institutes are visited by members of a team of language scholars and teachers carefully briefed in their purposes. When proposals from colleges and universities that have already had institutes are considered, the contract evaluations of their earlier institutes are taken into consideration.[2] In general, the institutes have been effective, and their quality results in part from this measure of supervision. Careful planning by USOE staff members and consultants and careful, critical evaluation by teams of competent professionals have had their effect.

---

[2] For the first two years of operation, the institutes were evaluated under contract with Middlebury College. More recent institutes have been evaluated under contracts with the MLA.

There has been some criticism of the selection of the colleges at which institutes have been established. Summer institutes have been held on the campuses of some of our largest and most prestigious universities and on the campuses of relatively obscure small colleges. Some scholars (in the larger institutions, naturally) have been dubious of the quality of the institutes on the smaller campuses.

Review of the evaluation reports indicates that there have been excellent institutes on the campuses of great universities, and inferior institutes. The same is true of the smaller campuses. An NDEA institute is more likely, however, to be a priority activity on a small campus. At a large university it may be lost among many summer activities. It brings to the campus temporary students not likely to become Ph.D. candidates and not very likely to return to the same institution for further graduate study. It requires an orientation toward teaching less typical of a graduate university faculty than of the faculty of a small undergraduate college. It brings no particular kudos to an already prestigious campus.

In a small college, it is not lost among many summer activities; sometimes it is the only summer activity. It does bring prestige to the institution. It may bring it the most advanced students it has. Finally, a summer institute on a small campus calls upon the services of a considerable portion of a small language faculty and also brings adjunct faculty to the campus. A summer institute at a small college is more likely to change the regular teacher education program than an institute at a large university. Clearly the quality of the proposals for institutes and the previous experience of the proposing college or university should continue to be the basis for award of contracts.

The Institute Program was established because "far too many [teachers of modern foreign languages] are inadequately trained, either in teaching methods or in the language itself, or both."[3]

Most language teachers in 1958 taught by traditional "grammar-translation" methods; they had themselves been taught that way.

[3] *School Life, Official Journal of the Office of Education,* Oct.-Nov. 1958, p. 10.

Many lacked both the language skills and the pedagogical skills necessary for audio-lingual teaching. The range of skills was great, however, and has been reflected in the institutes. A college or university conducting an institute generally defines the level of competence (especially in audio-lingual skills) with which it proposes to work and bases its admission of applicants partly on their prior experience and education and sometimes partly on tape-recordings of their speech. Native speakers or near native speakers have been enrolled in some institutes. At the other end of the scale, however, there have been institutes for teachers lacking the most minimal language skills, and such teachers have appeared in other institutes not designed for them. The rapid growth of language programs in elementary and secondary schools has resulted in the employment of such teachers in alarming numbers. Horror stories of their howlers circulate through the profession. During the summer of 1964 a special institute was held for institute graduates who had not reached a level of competence that justified assigning them to a second-level institute abroad.[4]

The profession is not agreed about the desirability of institutes for teachers with virtually no language competence. Some argue that the gain is not worth the cost, others that since these teachers will be teaching, like it or not, there is a special obligation to them and their pupils. In any event, that they will be teaching is a warning about future certification procedures and employment practices and a warning against establishing or expanding language programs before competent teachers are available.

THE TERMINATION OF INSTITUTES

The Institute Program has been essentially a remedial program, designed to correct deficiencies in the prior education of teachers already in service, to upgrade their skills, or to reorient them toward audio-lingual teaching. It could be hoped, if not presumed, that future teachers of foreign languages would not need to be upgraded in this way but would themselves have been taught by the audio-lingual approach, would have the language skills, and would be capable of using the new pedagogical methods and materials. For such teachers, formal summer institutes might not provide the best kind of continuing education. Foreign study and travel, more conventional graduate study, self-directed private study, local in-service training programs--any or all might be more appropriate.

---

[4] Donald D. Walsh, "The National Defense Language Institutes: A Critical Report," *PMLA*, LXXX (May 1965), 33-36.

Accordingly, a summary of the contract evaluations for 1963 and 1964 concludes as follows:

> There is much concern about the future of the institute program. It began as emergency retraining of teachers who had never acquired or had lost the language skills that they were being asked to teach. It has retrained over a third of all the secondary-school teachers of modern foreign languages. Not all language teachers need retraining, and a sizeable number leave the profession each year because of retirement, marriage, or more lucrative careers. Our real concern should be their replacements, those who enter the profession, fresh from college or graduate school. If our language departments are doing an effective job of teacher training, the institute program can be gradually limited to periodic refresher programs in the language skills and in new techniques of language teaching. It should not have to continue retraining recently graduated teachers. This training responsibility lies with the foreign-language departments of our colleges and universities.[5]

This is a widely held view:

> The ultimate goal of the institute program is—or should be—to work itself out of a job by making this kind of training unnecessary. Such a goal is attractive for a number of reasons. If—or when—we reach it, it will mean that the language teaching profession of the United States has, after the help of the Federal Government during a time of crisis, made itself capable of accepting responsibility for its own future again. It will mean specifically that we have been able to build our best thinking about the training of modern-foreign-language teachers into our regular teacher-training programs in colleges and universities throughout the country.[6]

Whatever the future of NDEA and its Language Development Program, the Institute Program is the part of it which is most clearly an emergency measure, a crash program, which should have relatively brief life expectancy. The USOE and the profession should anticipate its diminution and termination. When the time comes, the USOE in consultation with the profession should formulate plans for the orderly phasing down of the program. These plans should be public, so that states and local communities, schools and colleges, can also plan accordingly. This planning should not be delegated to government alone. The modern language teaching profession has an interest and a responsibility to develop alternative satisfactory programs for the education and continuing education of teachers of foreign languages. Leadership in the activity is another appropriate function of the MLA FL Program and of other professional organizations.

---

[5] Walsh, pp. 35-36.

[6] Mildred V. Boyer, "Language Institutes and Their Future," *PMLA*, LXXIX (Sept. 1964, Pt. 2), 11.

The timing depends on the colleges and universities, particularly upon their modern foreign language departments and their departments and schools of education.[7] For the modern language teaching profession has not yet built its best thinking about the education of foreign language teachers into all college and university programs by any means. This failure is highlighted by plans for institutes for this year's graduates and for future graduates of teacher education programs. Many prospective teachers who have had all of their collegiate education since the enactment of NDEA, who have only now completed the formal education designed by their colleges to prepare them to teach foreign languages, on whose teachers' certificates the ink is still wet, are expected to need institute training before beginning to teach. "Evidently the massive effort to retrain teachers is a losing one: the colleges and universities are turning out ill-prepared teachers faster than the Institutes can retrain them."[8]

TEACHER EDUCATION

Many scholars in the universities and colleges have contributed to the development of audio-lingual teaching. They have fostered its development through the language programs of the American Council of Learned Societies, through the FL Program of the MLA, as consultants to the USOE, as directors and evaluators and faculty of institutes, as research scholars in the new linguistics, as collaborators in the preparation of new teaching materials, by experiment with new pedagogical methods. Several hundred, with persuasive voices, have led in bringing about the renaissance of language teaching in the lower schools and the reformation that is accompanying it. But professors who advocate educational reforms often have more influence on their colleagues in the lower schools than on their colleagues in the universities, and language education in the colleges and universities has changed less than in the lower schools.

---

[7] An officer of the USOE suggests that the terminal date for institutes should be defined as five years after the colleges and universities demonstrate that they are doing the job in their regular programs. A professor of modern languages replies, "Then they are permanent."

[8] Elton Hocking, "The Schools Take Over Foreign Languages," *Journal of Secondary Education,* Oct. 1964, p. 248. See also Boyer, p. 16: "Institutes have now been in operation for six consecutive years—more than a whole college generation. If teacher candidates continue to be graduated from training schools unprepared for their jobs, this hardly strikes me as a responsibility of the government to be remedied through a crash program. NDEA came into being because of a national crisis. But if we as a profession allow the crisis to become permanent, it will be to our everlasting discredit."

The preparation of language teachers in regular academic programs has also changed less, in many colleges and universities has not changed very much, has not kept pace with the schools in which the young teachers will teach. Some college and university professors who have been visiting members of summer institute faculties have not been able to do at home and during the year what they have done with great enthusiasm in the institutes. In short, the profession has not yet assumed responsibility for its own future.

The responsibility belongs to the profession, not to the Congress or to the USOE. The MLA, through its FL Program, has sponsored conferences on ways and means of changing present undergraduate and graduate programs so as to improve the education of teachers and teachers of teachers. It is an important activity which should be continued. If college programs are not changed, many colleges and universities will continue to produce teachers who cannot do the job that is assigned to them. The profession will have repudiated the program its own leaders have advocated.

Some colleges and universities have changed their programs, of course—a few radically, some moderately. Some teachers competent in both language and pedagogy and capable of self-directed further growth are being graduated each year. The conferences proposed should call on the experience of the institutions that produce them. But there are other ways than weekend conferences by which the continued improvement of these institutions can be fostered and the spread of their influence encouraged. It would be advisable, for example, for the USOE to give special support to the language and education programs of a few such institutions in different parts of the country so that they may become demonstration centers for their regions. If funds to enable faculty of neighboring institutions to visit these demonstration centers or to take part in their activities are also needed, this too would be a worthy use of NDEA funds.

Where changes have taken place in elementary and secondary school programs, it has not been without travail. Neither will changes in college programs. In anticipation of some of the difficulties of the lower schools, the MLA has made available lists of experts who have volunteered to serve as consultants to schools undertaking new language programs or overhauling established ones. Language supervisors in the states also serve this function. The same procedures could be applied at the college level. Upon request, the MLA provides names of experts willing to serve, on invitation, as consultants to college and university language departments and education departments which wish to revise their programs or which have revised them and wish a disinterested evaluation. Institutional self-studies in preparation for such visits and the exchange of views and experience involved in them could have effects beyond the campuses visited. Institutions concerned to improve the quality of their programs for prospective teachers of modern languages would surely benefit from the activity. NDEA funds to support such a program would be well spent.

Significant curriculum revision takes thought and time and talk. Participation in the thought and the talk should be widespread among those who are involved in the program. MLA-sponsored conferences of a few professional leaders from widely scattered institutions can not replace the conversations and debates that must take place on many campuses if the reformation of language education is to continue. Such conferences can neither take the time nor secure the participation necessary for action, but they can begin the discussion. If the modern language and education faculties of a college or university, or a group of such faculties, wish to accomplish curricular reforms, they might well spend the better part of a summer in conference—in committee, as it were—to draft proposals for submission to their faculty colleagues. For such conferences, too, there might well be NDEA support.

In general, whatever means can be employed to encourage college and university faculties to review their programs should be used. Mildred Boyer suggests that the USOE could encourage such review by awarding contracts for institutes only to colleges and universities that submit evidence of improvement in their regular programs for potential teachers.*

---

* Boyer, p. 18.

THE EDUCATION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

It will not be enough for colleges and universities to examine only their programs for elementary and secondary school teachers: "improvement of teacher preparation must focus initially on the graduate school, the institution responsible for shaping not only teachers but teachers of teachers."[10]

The report from which this sentence is quoted is a place to start. After review of the undergraduate program (as the source of graduate students) and some recommendations for strengthening it, the report outlines five areas of competence necessary for the beginning college teacher and suggests means to foster the desired competence. It proposes that no graduate student should be entrusted with a class unless he has demonstrated his proficiency in the language by performance on *nationally* standardized examinations. Disregarding the "anti-educationist" prejudices of most foreign language departments, it proposes a graduate course in methods of teaching a foreign language and outlines its substance. It suggests the requirement of courses in linguistics, specifically general linguistics followed by contrastive studies of the major foreign language and English. It proposes "organized instruction in the various approaches to literary analysis, appreciation, criticism, and explication." By implication the report suggests that no first-year graduate student should be employed as a teaching fellow, that teaching fellows should be given much more help and supervision than they usually get, and that all collegiate courses should "use modern methods, including an audio-lingual beginning and maximal use of the foreign language." There is ample material for discussion, for debate, for action.

My recommendations that the MLA sponsor conferences on the language curriculum of higher education, that there be teams of consultants to work with colleges and universities undertaking program revision, and that there be NDEA-supported demonstration programs, are by no means meant to apply only to programs for the education of elementary and secondary school teachers. Scrutiny of graduate programs for potential college teachers is at least as important. They are indeed the source of our future teachers.

---

[10] Archibald T. MacAllister, "The Preparation of College Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages," *PMLA*, LXXIX (May 1964), 29.

MacAllister is not sanguine about the speed with which universities can or will change their educational programs. He notes that the conference on the preparation of college teachers "was aware of a number of factors, all understandable, which may delay these changes, perhaps for years, whereas the need for action is urgent and immediate."[11]

The report therefore proposes, as an interim measure, the establishment of seminars for college faculty members, proposes that these seminars be held in a country in which the language is spoken, and proposes a curriculum which parallels its proposals for revision of the standard Ph.D. program. No one can say how many, but there is general agreement that there are a good many college teachers now in service who lack the skills necessary to audio-lingual teaching and to the emphasis on understanding the whole culture as well as literature. They have themselves not been educated by audio-lingual methods, have had little or no opportunity to enhance their oral fluency by travel or study abroad, and consequently lack competence in the spoken language. Many lack knowledge of the linguistic and psychological principles on which audio-lingual teaching is based. Some, in spite of traditional emphasis on literary study, are too little acquainted with critical theory. Few have had much orientation toward broader study of a foreign culture. In short, some college teachers are without the skills and knowledge expected of their students.

Although many college teachers to whom this description applies are beginners, who can plan to remedy the deficiencies of their education in continuing graduate work, perhaps most are older. Many, a few years removed from graduate study, located in colleges whose salary schedules and other provisions for faculty growth are inadequate for summer study or for travel, or even for attendance at professional meetings, have had little opportunity for professional growth. For their benefit, the device of NDEA seminars for college teachers should be tried.

I suspect, however, that for most college teachers who have concluded their formal schooling (after the master's degree or the doctorate) formal prescribed summer programs may not be the best way of fostering continuing growth. Opportunities for self-directed graduate study or for continued study toward the doctorate may be much more valuable for some. This report elsewhere recommends increased provision for study abroad for language teachers.[12] Language professors are not the highest paid classification in American colleges and universities, but they are the only faculty for whom, as a group, foreign study and travel comes close to being a professional necessity. They must find the money for it.

---

[11] Ibid., p. 39.

SPECIALIZED INSTITUTES

Until a new generation of well-trained teachers is available, the Institute Program provides a means of upgrading teachers presently in the profession. The standard institute is designed to meet the needs of most teachers. But there are also some special areas for which more specialized institutes have been and should be conducted. FLES enthusiasts think priority should be given to institutes for specialist teachers of foreign languages in elementary schools (FLES).

FLES programs take so many forms that the specialist teachers need different kinds of competence for work in different school systems. Some are directly responsible for language instruction as visiting teachers in charge of the language work of many classes. Some are responsible for in-service training programs for grade teachers working with television. Others are themselves responsible for closed-circuit or local open-circuit television instruction.

There have been a few special institutes for teachers working with externally prepared television programs. If the numbers warrant it, perhaps there should be special institutes for elementary school language specialists who will themselves be presenting television lessons. And for the future our colleges and universities should include attention to the techniques of television and other technological means of instruction in curricula for potential elementary school teachers and language specialists. Institutes for language specialists who conduct in-service training programs should also be considered.

In my judgment, the most promising future for FLES lies in televised and programed instruction, perhaps in a combination of closed-circuit television and programed learning. There are TV programs now—good ones. No doubt there will be better ones. In any event, we are more likely to have good televised and programed courses than enough language specialists to go around or grade teachers competent to teach foreign languages without such external aids.[13] Further research in the teaching of languages by means of television and other technological teaching aids and methods is recommended elsewhere in this report.[14]

---

[12] See pp. 66-68.

In the meantime, television teaching of foreign languages, especially in elementary schools, is growing very rapidly. In Massachusetts alone, in 1962, 512 schools were using the TV series *Parlons Français*. Of these, 101 depended solely on educational television, 58 used television and a language specialist, 76 used television and a specialist but also involved the grade teacher, 11 used various other combinations, and the remaining 266 used television and the classroom teacher without the aid of a language specialist.[15] With television in use on this scale, we cannot wait for a new generation of teachers. Since the present teachers depend for in-service training and for guidance upon present language specialists and supervisors, it is institutes for specialists and supervisors that are most likely to have long-range effect on the quality of FLES programs.

Specialized institutes may be desirable to deal with other special problems. There have been a few institutes for teachers of English as a second language. Probably there should be more in different parts of the country. There are many non-English-speaking American children—Spanish-speaking in the Southwest, in Florida, in New York City, in a good many of our cities; French-speaking on the Northeast Canadian border, and so on.[16] They need to learn English, and they will learn it best if it is taught them as (what it is for them) a second language.

[13] An important Denver experiment combined locally prepared television instruction, programed lessons, in-service training for grade teachers, and the participation of parents in the teaching of Spanish in the fifth and sixth grades. (Wilbur Schramm et al., *The Context of Instructional Television,* Summary Report of Research Findings, The Denver-Stanford Project, Denver, Colo. and Stanford, Calif., June 1964.) This study is NDEA Title VI Project No. 354. There are excellent discussions of TV and of programing in Elton Hocking, *Language Laboratory and Language Learning,* Dept. of Audiovisual Instruction, National Education Association (Washington, D.C., 1964).

[14] See pp. 40-50.

[15] "Report and Recommendations on the Teaching of Foreign Languages in Massachusetts Public Schools." Office of Modern Langs., Div. of Elementary and Secondary Educ., Mass. Dept. of Educ., mimeographed (Boston, May 1964).

[16] Bruce Gaarder refers to a Louisiana community in which everyone could speak French except the French teacher. *PMLA,* LXXX (May 1965), 19.

But the American child whose mother tongue is not English also deserves education in his *mother* tongue—not as a second language.

> There is no denying that the English they should be taught is English as a second language. Drop-out and failure statistics bear out the inadvisability of our present widespread policy of obliging these children to follow the identical curriculum offered to English-speaking children: a "sink or swim" policy with a distressingly large number of sinkers. English *is*, I think, their sometimes frantically immediate need, but not their most fundamental one. Success in school has connections all too obvious with such matters as self image, mental stability and health, delinquency, and social and economic status. To make this success possible . . . the fundamental need is for establishing a legitimate educational foundation in the mother tongue . . . The potential products of such programs are our best hope for what Theodore Andersson calls "literate bilinguals instead of bilingual illiterates."[17]

The suggestion that there be institutes to help teachers teach non-English-speaking children in their mother tongue has obvious merit. Spanish-speaking children, for example, should have some opportunity in the grades to learn in their mother tongue while they learn English as a second language. In high school they should have the opportunity to study Spanish as English-speaking children study English. Since there are few teachers competent to teach this way, a crash program of institutes can help. But schools in polyglot areas will have to revise their curricula if such teachers are to have much opportunity to employ their new skills. For the long pull, some teacher education institutions should introduce programs designed for prospective teachers of children whose mother tongue is not English.

They cannot do so very effectively, nor can the institutes be very effective, until there are appropriate materials for such teaching. It would be desirable for the USOE to support the development of teaching materials for the languages of the major non-English-speaking groups in the country. Materials for the teaching of English as a second language are being developed under NDEA contracts. So might materials for education in the mother tongue. The USOE might also support, and the MLA and other professional associations might well sponsor, conferences on the problems of teaching non-English-speaking children in the United States.

There have been institutes for American-born teachers who are native speakers of foreign languages and for foreign-born native speakers of the foreign language. (They are not always distinguished from one another.) Since these groups have the inestimable advantage of being native speakers of the language, both are valuable sources of new teachers. But they do not need the same things. Obviously, both groups need to be taught to teach and both need to learn the relevant linguistics. But American-born speakers of a foreign language also need to study the culture of the country whose language they have inherited. For them, overseas institutes might be invaluable, with stress on culture in the curriculum. The foreign-born potential teacher, on the other hand, needs urgently to learn about American culture and American schools. He needs full realization that the language he is to teach is *foreign* to his pupils. Both groups, of course, need education that will lead ultimately to certification. In spite of the advantage of basic audio-lingual skills, there is a great deal to learn. For native speakers without background in education, the year-long institutes may be best.

---

[17] Boyer, p. 12.

There have been a few year-long institutes for other purposes. They have special problems, which are succinctly described in the summary of institute evaluations for 1964:

> . . . they suffer from a variety of economic handicaps. Since the stipend for participants is only seventy-five dollars a week plus fifteen dollars a week for each dependent . . . few established teachers can afford to exchange their year's teaching salary for the NDEA stipend . . . The consequent lack of competition for places makes it difficult for institute directors to make a good selection of participants, and there is a constant danger that a few weak participants will be admitted and that the institute will have to put up with them for a whole year.
>
> Attendance at an academic-year institute has a greater appeal for young teachers just out of college with few or no family responsibilities . . . It would be well to consider whether these institutes should not be planned exclusively for such participants, awarding places to the ablest and most promising language majors, after a thorough screening, giving a year of intensive and advanced training to the future leaders in the field.[18]

Year-long institutes for native speakers of foreign languages preparing to teach seem to me preferable to year-long institutes for outstanding recent graduates. Regular graduate programs are available to recent graduates, and the expanded NDEA fellowship program will give them opportunity.[19]

[18] Walsh, p. 35.

[19] Academic-year institutes have found some useful models in a variety of Master of Arts (MAT) programs developed in recent years at a number of universities.

Specialized institutes, like standard institutes, are reproaches to the universities. If there is need for special training for television teachers, for language supervisors and others responsible for the in-service training of language teachers, for teachers of non-English-speaking American children, for native speakers of foreign languages who are not trained teachers, it should be provided in regular university programs. And the universities should be producing the necessary special materials. When the colleges and universities finally do their job, there will be less need for specialized institutes as well as less need for standard ones.

VII

State Services, Equipment and Materials for Improvement of Instruction

The National Defense Education Act, through Title III, has provided financial aid to states in the joint efforts of the states and the federal government to improve instruction in the sciences, mathematics, and the modern foreign languages. The Act has authorized appropriations up to seventy million dollars a year for payments to state educational agencies for the acquisition of equipment and materials for teaching in these fields, for minor remodeling necessitated by the new equipment, and for loans to nonprofit private schools for these purposes. It has also authorized appropriations up to five million each year for payments to state educational agencies to carry out programs for expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in public elementary and secondary schools in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and for administration of the state plan.

The act as amended in October 1964 increases the authorization for equipment and materials and minor remodeling from seventy million to ninety million dollars for the fiscal year ending 30 June 1965, and for each of the three succeeding years. It increases the authorization for supervisory and related services and administration from five million to ten million annually. But it also adds five new fields as eligible for support: history, civics, geography, English, and reading in public elementary and secondary schools. Federal funds are to be matched, dollar for dollar, by state and local funds.[1]

---

[1] **The matching does not always result in corresponding increases in local expenditures. Sometimes matching funds are reallocated to support science,**

Chapter Seven

LANGUAGE SUPERVISORS

Although the authorizations and appropriations allocate much larger sums for equipment, materials, and remodeling than for personnel and administration, the state supervisory services have been a more important contribution of Title III than the equipment and materials. The narrative reports of Title III activities submitted by the states indicate an impressive range of duties undertaken by state supervisors of language instruction, although what they do differs from state to state in terms of the number, interests, and capacities of the supervisors and in terms of differing state organizations and policies.

One of the most important functions performed by most state supervisors is that of organizing, conducting, and participating in in-service training programs for language teachers in the various communities of their states:

> Science, mathematics, and foreign language supervisors in nearly all States participating in Title III conducted in-service training in the form of workshops, conferences, demonstrations, and other meetings at both elementary and secondary levels. The workshops varied in length from one-half day to six weeks, but those most frequently scheduled were for two days or less. . . . Requests for the service of specialists far exceeded the resources of the States to meet the demand.
>
> Supervisors in a majority of the States placed major emphasis on workshops . . . Outstanding teachers who had participated in NDEA Title VI institutes for foreign languages sometimes served as demonstration teachers or consultants . . . College and university personnel and local supervisors frequently served as temporary state employees to conduct workshops.[2]

A California study of the effect of NDEA on California schools includes a questionnaire survey in which administrators were asked to comment on "changes in teacher effectiveness" resulting from NDEA. Five out of six of the administrators who responded affirmed that California teachers are significantly more effective than they were before NDEA, presumably as a result of it.[3]

---

mathematics, or foreign languages from other purposes for which they would have been expended. Often expenditures that would have been made anyway (for salaries, or for equipment, materials, or remodeling) are matched against federal funds. On the other hand, some states have over-matched the federal funds.

[2] Marjorie C. Johnston, "Summary of State Supervisory and Related Services under Title III of the National Defense Education Act," mimeographed report of the Director, Instructional Resources Branch, USOE.

[3] Donald W. Johnson, *The Dynamics of Educational Change,* Calif. State

In California, part of the funds allocated for supervisory and related services have been used to secure short-term consultants. With the added personnel in the state offices, these consultants have "conducted workshops, assisted in the analysis of content and method and the development of curriculum guides and courses of study, and advised administrators in the selection of language laboratory equipment and in the design of science laboratories. The program has been credited as being of great assistance not only because of the quality of the personnel the state was able to provide but also because of the ability of the consultants to focus upon specific instructional problems in working with the school districts."[4] The state bureau, with additional personnel, has also been enabled to respond to more requests for consulting services and for more workshops and seminars. In 1958, the first year of the program, there were 60 workshops and conferences in secondary school language teaching and learning, with from 20 to 650 participants. The state office receives two and three times as many requests for assistance as it can honor, however, whether through the services of its regular personnel or through the services of short-term consultants. "The shortage of funds to provide enough qualified consultants . . . makes school administrators in California still consider expert consultant service to be their greatest unmet need."[5]

The importance placed upon supervisory services in state reports, in the reports of the USOE, and in the judgment of language educators generally, suggests that Title III allocations of funds for supervisory services and for equipment, materials, and remodeling should be more nearly equal.[6] Even if more funds were available, however, there would still be some states without supervisors, for with matching funds available a dozen or so states are without them.[7] Some state offices of education prefer not to

---

Dept. of Educ. (Sacramento, 1963), p. 85. This is an important study and is itself an NDEA-supported product. We do not need comparable studies for all fifty states, but a few other states with problems different from California's might well undertake them.

[4] Ibid., p. 94.

[5] Ibid., p. 107.

[6] This is a recommendation of John H. Fisher's unpublished memorandum, "Needed Legislation in Support of Modern-Foreign-Language Teaching."

[7] Before NDEA there were 8 state modern foreign language supervisors in two states and the District of Columbia. In 1964 there were 58 in 38 states,

have specialist supervisors; some have been unable to attract and hold them at the salaries provided.[8]

There is a severe shortage of people competent to fill supervisory positions, as there is a shortage of expertness generally. For the most part, supervisors must be attracted away from the classroom. The job of state supervisor is difficult, demanding, and responsible. It carries with it the inconvenience of extensive, indeed constant, travel within the state. It requires energy and tact as well as expertness. The not uncommon salaries of seven to eight thousand dollars a year can hardly be expected to attract and hold the ablest people. The job should be reclassified, where it is underpaid, in terms of its importance and difficulty and commensurate salaries should be assigned to it. It is a major administrative task and should command a salary commensurate with those of other major school administrators. Those states which have not appointed specialist supervisors should consider their advantages—and, when they make appointments, establish adequate salaries.

In-service programs for language teachers are extremely important, particularly in fields like modern languages in which new techniques and equipment are bringing about a revolution in teaching. Teachers should have as much opportunity as possible to enhance their competence. NDEA Title VI institutes and programs initiated by Title III state supervisors, by local administrators and supervisors, by professional organizations, by colleges and

---

counting the District. Before 1964, the total amounts appropriated for supervisory services under Title III had never been expended, for they had not been matched by the states. Since December 1963 it has been possible to reallocate funds not sought by some states to others capable of matching them. This not only spares the USOE the bureaucratic embarrassment of returning money to the treasury, it also enables some states to receive sums greater than those originally allocated for their use by the prescribed formula.

[8] It has been suggested that the NDEA requirement of dollar-for-dollar matching (for the entire Title III program, not merely for supervisory services) works to the advantage of the richer states and to the disadvantage of poorer states and neglects an opportunity to foster national equalization of educational opportunity. By analogy with federal highway programs, for example, it is suggested that states be required to match federal funds with considerably less than equal amounts of money. Such a change might encourage poorer states to take more advantage of the Title III program, but states must also recognize the importance of supervisory services if they are to make the best use of them.

universities, are all part of the complex of opportunity. As long as many teachers remain unskilled in the use of the new techniques, perhaps still unconvinced of their value or of the validity of the educational objectives they reflect, in-service education will be needed. Growing and multiplying school programs in modern languages demand more access to expert advice and more supervisory personnel, even more than they require new equipment. One or two language experts in a state office, charged with responsibility to improve language education throughout a state, can do something, but not enough. Two-day workshops conducted each year in a quarter of the counties of a state certainly cannot do enough, but may be more than a supervisor can manage. In-service education of teachers is a continuing need in every local community. It can be encouraged throughout a state by competent state supervisors. It can be encouraged in local communities and conducted as a continuing activity by local supervisors. But there are not enough of them. Even large cities are often without specialist supervisors, and smaller communities seldom have them.

NDEA does not provide funds for local supervisors. Instead, matching funds are available for supervisory services only at the state level and cannot be channeled (like funds for equipment) to the school systems of the states. "The restricting of expenditures of supervisory funds to the state agency is an arbitrary and unwise provision of the law."[9] It should be changed to make federal funds available to match local funds for salaries and related expenses of supervisory personnel in local school systems.

The importance of supervisory services has been illustrated here chiefly by reference to in-service educational programs for teachers. But the conduct of workshops and similar in-service programs is far from being the only function of state language supervisors, and it is a duty that might be diminished if adequate local supervisory services were available. The narrative reports submitted by state officers to the USOE indicate a great range of other duties.

Many supervisors provide advisory services to schools planning to acquire new equipment and materials and nearly all review acquisition projects as part of the procedure of approval.[10]

---

[9] Johnson, p. 138.

[10] This is an important function. During the first year of NDEA (in 1958) states were not required to match funds for supervisory services, and they were allowed to spread planned expenditures for equipment, materials, and

Many state language supervisors take part in professional meetings and conferences in their states and work closely with committees of their professional organizations. Among the relative "failures" of the MLA Foreign Language Program prior to NDEA was its inability to encourage "the growth and effectiveness of language organizations in the individual states."[11] State supervisors have helped to unify the profession. Some have been instrumental in organizing or strengthening state organizations and all have served as liaison among teachers of the several languages and among language teachers in different levels of schools. A good many state supervisors work with the colleges of their states in planning NDEA-supported institutes and other teacher-education programs. New courses have been introduced into the programs of a few colleges engaged in teacher education, at the urging of the state supervisor. In more than one state, television courses on the new methods of language teaching, for teachers in service, have been undertaken by such colleges on the recommendation of state supervisors.

State supervisors try to keep the teachers of their states informed of new developments in language teaching and in NDEA. They distribute publications, announcements, teaching guides, guides for establishing laboratories, and other materials from the USOE, from professional associations, from a variety of sources. They undertake the preparation of publications—surveys and studies of language teaching in their several states, their own bibliographies and guides and manuals (e.g., for preparing NDEA proposals in accordance with the state plan). By 1963 more than 120 NDEA-financed state publications of this kind had been produced.

The Act requires states seeking Title III funds to submit state plans for the use of those funds. Many state offices of education in turn require local communities to submit plans for their programs, subject to approval, and often prepared with the advice and assistance of the specialists in the state office. Thus one of the indirect contributions of NDEA Title III has been the encourage-

---

remodeling over two years rather than one. These provisions were intended to encourage states to add language-teaching experts to their staffs to help the schools plan changes in their programs and to discourage hasty and ill-considered purchase of equipment and materials. It did not always work.

[11] Kenneth W. Mildenberger, "The Foreign Language Program, 1952–58: Report and Evaluation," *PMLA,* LXXIV (May 1959), 44.

ment of better planning and more long-range planning in local school systems. State supervisors have been active participants.

This catalogue of the functions performed by state language supervisors makes it quite clear that the services which can be provided by one or two specialists working out of the state capital are far from enough to accomplish the basic task of improving language instruction throughout a state, even in conjunction with all the other developments in progress in language education. The supervisors do what they can, but it is not enough. For example, the USOE undertook a pilot survey of foreign language teaching equipment and its use in 16 states, to throw some light on the preparation of teachers (or their lack of it) for the proper use of the electro-mechanical equipment at their disposal. The report shows that of 6,423 foreign language teachers in its population, 3,750 had had some training in the use of language learning equipment during the preceding four years—and that 2,673 had not. It also points out that "the 'training' referred to could of course have been anything from one Saturday morning session on the manipulation of a tape recorder to an 8-weeks' NDEA institute course in modern teaching methods." Since most of the teachers who had any training at all had it only in brief workshops, the report concludes that "in 1962-63 many—perhaps most—teachers . . . did not have sufficient training in the use of their equipment."[12]

If more than half the teachers in a state have had some training in the use of the new equipment and materials and the new methods of language teaching, a good deal has been accomplished. But if more than 40 per cent have had no training and if most of the rest have had inadequate training, we have no grounds for complacency. Every professional has an obligation to keep up with the new developments of his profession, but he also needs the opportunity. State and local language supervisors should be key people in planning, encouraging, and conducting in-service programs for the continuing professional education of language teachers. They should regard it as their most important responsibility. But until the Congress, the states, and local communities recognize that people are still more important than machines in education and spend their educational dollars accordingly, we shall not fully realize Parker's projection that "In the long run the most important consequence of Title III may be not the acquisition of useful 'hardware,' but this increased leadership at the State level, and the new spirit of cooperation between colleges and public schools. These forces, eventually affecting teacher training, certification requirements, preparation of new teacher materials, and curriculum revision, may well do more to improve foreign language instruction than any number of labs."[13]

---

[12] A. Bruce Gaarder, "A Pilot Survey of Foreign Language Equipment in 16 States," mimeographed, USOE (Washington, D.C., 1964). The pilot study surveys sixteen states. A national survey was projected but canceled as beyond the means of the USOE. This illustrates two things: the perennial problem of understaffing in the USOE and the desirability of contract evaluations. Surely a 76 million dollar program should be evaluated.

LANGUAGE LABORATORIES

Equipment and materials are less important than people, but the electro-mechanical equipment called "the language laboratory" and the audio-visual, audio-lingual aids and materials that accompany it can be invaluable. Teachers and administrators are coming to realize that the question, "Is teaching with the help of a language laboratory more effective than teaching without it?" can be answered only in terms of what is being taught. Although it is of little use for traditional grammar-translation teaching and of little use, as yet, for the direct teaching of reading and writing, the language laboratory is an important tool of audio-lingual teaching. It fosters the ability to understand the spoken word and the ability to speak. Because it does, it also fosters the ability to read without translating. If the student is to master the audio-lingual skills, he must have time to hear, to practice speaking aloud, and to learn to control the language.[14] The language laboratory provides one physical means to do this. Relieving the teacher of many of his traditional drill-master chores, it helps free him to teach.

Since the language laboratory fosters the new, broader objectives of language teaching, its proper use requires many teachers to redefine the objectives of their teaching. It also requires them to make radical changes in their teaching procedures—in habits established by long practice. It follows that no school should install a language laboratory without careful advance planning. If a laboratory is to be used properly, extensive reeducation of the school's language teachers is usually required. For relatively few language teachers have had the use of language laboratories in their own learning, and few have had much experience with them during student teaching.[15]

---

[13] William R. Parker, *The National Interest and Foreign Languages,* pp. 13-14.

[14] See Alfred S. Hayes, *Language Laboratory Facilities,* U. S. Govt. Printing Office (Washington, D.C., 1963), pp. 15-16: "understanding and speaking are to a large extent matters of habit, rather than matters of knowledge. "The only known way to form habits is through practice . . . yet failure to make satisfactory progress in a foreign language has been traditionally attributed to insufficient *study* rather than to the real cause, insufficient practice. . . . To provide this practice is the fundamental role of the language laboratory."

In 1958, as near as anyone can tell, there were 64 language laboratories in public and private secondary schools in the United States.[16] In 1964 there were more than 6,000.[17] "The language laboratory responded to a new and urgent need. Coincidentally, the National Defense Education Act . . . recognized this need and provided matching funds for purchase of equipment. The combination was irresistible."[18]

It was not irresistible to all school systems. There are almost 30,000 high schools in the country, not 6,000. Moreover, many of the 6,000 laboratories in existence are inadequate, and others are inadequately used. Although it is the smaller schools, for the most part, that do not have laboratories, it is obvious that many high school students of foreign languages do not yet have access to what can be a valuable aid to learning.

Nevertheless, growth from 64 to more than 6,000 in six years is a staggering rate, and not all schools have undertaken the advance planning that a laboratory installation requires. A good many high schools "now have shining language laboratories that are merely gathering dust because the teachers do not have the proper teaching materials, or do not know how to use the materials or the laboratories."[19]

The USOE pilot survey shows not only that "many—perhaps most—teachers did not have sufficient training in the use of their

[15] Witness the Oregon report, cited in Ch. vi, that even among newly appointed teachers three-fourths have not been trained in the new methods.

[16] Joseph C. Hutchinson, *The Language Laboratory*, U. S. Govt. Printing Office (Washington, D.C., 1963), p. 3.

[17] Joseph C. Hutchinson, "The Language Laboratory, How Effective Is It?" *School Life*, Jan.-Feb. 1964, p. 14.

[18] Elton Hocking, *Language Laboratory and Language Learning*, p. 10.

[19] John H. Fisher, "Needed Legislation . . ."

equipment," it also shows that although many schools have inadequate installations, teachers do not find them inadequate.[20] The report speculates that this may reflect the fact that many language teachers are still not fully committed to the centrality of audio-lingual skills among the objectives of language education. It quotes the Northeast Conference report on foreign languages in the secondary school: "But the crux of the matter is this: we know that two years is not enough for learning to understand and speak a foreign language, yet by the end of two years, or even earlier, many teachers no longer regard these skills as central. . . . There exists a strong tendency to neglect or even abandon the audio-lingual skills, even after good beginnings have been made."[21] What is essential, if the laboratory is to serve its purpose, is understanding and acceptance of the purpose it can serve and skill in its use.

From the beginning of NDEA support for the purchase of laboratory and other equipment and materials, there have been more language laboratories than people who know how to use them and what they are useful for. Especially at the beginning, there was too little expertness in the buying, too little planning, too little recognition of scheduling problems, too little recognition that appropriate teaching materials are more important than electronic equipment and that the skills of the teacher are more important than either. Above all, appropriate teaching materials (and teachers' guides to them) were not readily available, and few teachers know how to prepare them.

A number of NDEA-supported (and other) activities have helped to correct this situation: Appropriate materials for teaching the common languages have become available through commercial publishers and manufacturers, partly stimulated by early NDEA contracts. Language supervisors in many states are available to help schools plan installations and to help with the selection of appropriate materials and with the relevant in-service training. NDEA summer institutes have given thousands of teachers training in the use of the laboratory and broader training in the audio-lingual teaching of which the laboratory is an instrument.

---

[20] A. Bruce Gaarder, "A Pilot Survey . . ."

[21] "Foreign Languages in the Secondary School," in *Foreign Language Teaching: Ideals and Practices.* Reports of the Working Committees, 1964 Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, ed., George Fenwick Jones (Baltimore, Md., 1964), pp. 23, 26. Quoted from Gaarder, "A Pilot Survey . . ."

Two USOE publications, supported by NDEA Title III and Title VII funds, and a publication of the Council of Chief State School Officers have provided important guidance in the planning, purchase, and use of the laboratory, and the MLA has published a useful guide to modern language teaching materials.[22] There have been articles on the problems and advantages of the laboratory in professional and popular journals. There have been conferences on the subject. One, sponsored by the MLA under an NDEA contract, resulted in a list of "Do's and Don'ts" for language laboratories that has had wide circulation.[23] Language laboratories may still be installed in some schools without adequate advice or adequate preparation (sometimes on the initiative of administrators or school boards without consultation with the language teacher), but it is easier to avoid mistakes than it was.

Language laboratories are not all alike. "Installations vary greatly, from simple listening corners having a single playback machine to fully equipped laboratories in which each pupil has a semiprivate booth complete with microphone, activated earphones, and facilities for recording and playing back his imitation of the model."[24]

Language laboratories are new and are still changing rapidly. They were first installed in colleges, and those in secondary schools followed the college model: a single room elaborately equipped with booths or stations, to which students went to practice and study apart from regular class time. Moving secondary school students from classroom to laboratory for a part of a period

[22] Alfred S. Hayes, *Language Laboratory Facilities, Technical Guide for the Selection, Purchase, Use and Maintenance,* U. S. Govt. Printing Office (Washington, D.C., 1963). Joseph C. Hutchinson, *The Language Laboratory,* U. S. Govt. Printing Office (Washington, D.C., 1961). Council of Chief State School Officers with the Assistance of Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., and others, *Purchase Guide for Programs in Science, Mathematics, Modern Foreign Languages* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1959). M. J. Ollmann, ed., *Selective List of Materials for Use by Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages* (New York: MLA, 1962).

[23] *A Dozen Do's and Don'ts for Planning and Operating a Language Lab or an Electronic Classroom in a High School.* Printed and distributed for the MLA by Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. (New York, 1961).

[24] E. Glenn Featherston and John R. Ludington, in Joseph C. Hutchinson, *The Language Laboratory,* Foreword, p. ii.

is wasteful, however, and administratively difficult. The single room is hard to schedule so as to provide daily practice for every student at every level of instruction. Curently the trend is to install simpler equipment in every language classroom, for daily use during a part of the class period of every class. Of course this trend, too, may be reversed in the future, especially if new developments in programed learning make the laboratory more nearly a self-contained teaching installation for some part of language learning, or as other changes result from current widespread experiment with teaching technology.

Schools contemplating language laboratory installations are commonly advised to seek the services of a professional consultant. The qualifications of different kinds of consultants used in different ways are outlined in Hayes's manual.[25] Because change is so rapid in the field of electronic teaching equipment, and because the design of a laboratory and the selection of equipment for it is indeed no job for a layman, many schools do seek more help than they can get from all too readily available manufacturers' representatives. Since qualified consultants are hard to find or select, the USOE or state departments of education might well undertake to provide or to establish a consulting service for schools contemplating installation of language laboratories.

In summary, a language laboratory takes advance planning and requires in-service training of teachers. Schools that have installed laboratories should make certain that their teachers know how to use them effectively and should provide in-service training for them. Schools that install laboratories in the future should first make sure that the language teachers who are to use them are committed to the approach to which the laboratory is an aid and will be able to make effective use of the equipment.

Administrators also need orientation to the language laboratory. They must understand the scheduling that makes optimum use of it possible. They must understand that it does not lessen the work of the teacher; on the contrary, the management of a laboratory takes additional professional time. They must understand that the annual budget must include a sizable fraction of the initial cost of the laboratory for regular maintenance, depreciation, and replacement, that it must include provision for tapes, records, and other expendable equipment and materials, that no laboratory can

[25] Alfred S. Hayes, pp. 22-24.

be operated at full capacity, and that an elaborate installation will require a technician (not the teacher) to maintain it.[26] The school system that will not provide for the operation of a language laboratory or is unwilling to increase the cost of its language instruction should not have a language laboratory. It is as unrealistic to install a language laboratory without providing the materials that make it usable as to install a chemistry laboratory without providing chemicals and experimental equipment.

OTHER EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS

During the first five years of the NDEA Title III program, there were 27,070 state projects for the acquisition of equipment or for minor remodeling (or both) in the area of modern languages. Since laboratories are estimated at only 6,000, it is clear that Title III support for language-teaching equipment and materials is by no means simply a laboratory program, even though the language laboratory has had the publicity and has become a symbol of the program. The most cursory examination of *NDEA Title III Guidelines* and of the *MLA Selective List of Materials* indicates how varied the program has been and can be.

NDEA Title III Guidelines, published in 1964, represents four years of experience in the operation of the program.

> That experience had indicated, among a number of other things, that program regulations had not provided an adequate basis for determining the eligibility of expenditures for equipment, materials, minor remodeling, and personnel services, or for documentation of such determinations. Fiscal audits by the Regional Grant-in-Aid Auditors and by the General Accounting Office had resulted in audit questions amounting to substantial sums of money in a number of States. In order to guard against the periodic repetition of such adverse audit findings, the Office of Education developed the Guidelines to Title III, NDEA, Regulations.[27]

The *Guidelines* volume includes some general discussion of the nature and purposes of the categorical aid program, a chapter on the nature of local projects and the educational planning that should underlie them, a chapter on the requirement that states establish standards "in accord with the Act, Regulations, Guidelines, and Policy Bulletins," and an exposition of the supervisory and related services for which grants are made. A large part of the book is made up, however, of illustrative lists of laboratory and other special equipment, materials, and types of remodeling that are eligible or ineligible for reimbursable purchase—in terms of their special relevance to the teaching of science, mathematics, or foreign languages.

---

[26] *A Dozen Do's and Don'ts.*

[27] *NDEA Title III Guidelines*, Introduction, p. iv.

Schools have indeed been assisted in the installation of language laboratories and in the purchase of lesser electronic teaching equipment. For the language laboratory or (if applicable) for use in the language classroom, the following are listed as examples of eligible equipment: amplifiers and preamplifiers, auxiliary classroom speakers, headphones, interconnecting accessories such as jackboxes, switches, and wiring for language laboratory systems, microphones, mobile language lab carts or units, portable dividers, record players, short wave receivers, specially wired tables, student booths, student stations, tape recorders or decks, teacher consoles, two-way classroom or laboratory inter-communication systems, typewriters with special keyboards.

General purpose furniture and equipment are ineligible: e.g., bulletin boards, chairs, tables, ordinary chalkboards, ordinary teacher's desks, student lockers, clocks, air conditioners, erasers, office equipment, paper cutter or trimmer, pencil sharpeners, pointers, and the like, whether or not they are for use in the language laboratory or classroom.[28]

With NDEA assistance, a school can establish an audiovisual library, a "facility for the collection, custody, cataloguing, maintenance, and distribution of audiovisual materials for science, mathematics, or modern foreign language education," which may include among its functions purchase and preparation of such materials as kinescopes, films, filmstrips, recordings, tapes, mounted still pictures, charts, and models.[29] The school may also buy darkening shades, flannel and magnetic boards, record players, tape recorders, playbacks, television receivers, television reception accessories, and a variety of equipment for production or reproduction of audiovisual materials.[30] It may buy maps and globes and such realia as coins and stamps.[31]

[28] Ibid., p. 10.

[29] Ibid., p. 15.

[30] Ibid., p. 11. The new regulations, following the amendment of the Act in October 1964, make still more television equipment eligible.

[31] Ibid., p. 20.

A school may build up its library of books in the fields for which aid is authorized. In modern foreign languages "books, periodicals, or bulletins on any subject *written in the foreign language taught* in the school are eligible. Also eligible are books, periodicals, or pamphlets written in English, provided that they interpret or reflect background or give insight into the life of the people whose language is being taught in the school. Such works may include, for example, literature in translation, history, geography, biography, art, music, architecture, sociology, and anthropology."[32] Professional books for the teacher's use and general reference books are eligible. Books used as basic textbooks are not. A school may acquire equipment to grade tests.

In the State of Washington, during the fiscal year 1964, applications for assistance in modern language instruction broke down as follows:

MFL Applications by Categories for Fiscal Year 1964
State of Washington

		No. Purch.
Language Laboratories	$134,265.01	30
Tape Recorders	42,982.41	248
Record Players	14,400.00	155
Television Sets	55,670.63	424
Foreign Language Tapes	9,303.21	
Blank Tape	3,220.96	
Films and Filmstrips	23,999.67	
Maps, Magazines, Pictures, etc.	2,643.79	
Books	4,434.26	
Misc. carts, mikes, etc.	11,818.81	
Records	3,139.88	
Projectors	13,146.55	32
Special Typewriters	1,347.55	10

THE SELECTIVE LIST

A fuller and more detailed appreciation of the range and value of the materials these provisions have made available to the schools may be gained from the *MLA Selective List*[33] (itself prepared under an NDEA contract and of course purchasable under the Act as a professional book). A volume of 162 two-column pages, it lists materials available for teaching ten languages at elementary and secondary school levels. Materials relevant to all languages are listed under the following headings:

---

[32] Ibid., p. 19.

[33] Ollmann (see n. 22).

Bibliographies and Resource Lists
Books on Methodology
Films, Filmstrips and Slides
FLES
Language Laboratory
Linguistics and Language Learning
Periodicals
Pictures
Supplementary Materials

For the several languages for which they are available, materials are listed under the following headings:

Basic Texts
Bibliographies and Resource Lists
Books of Culture and Civilization
Books of Songs
Books on Methodology
Conversation Books
Dictionaries
Discs and Tapes: Cultural
Discs and Tapes: Language
Discs and Tapes: Literary
Discs and Tapes: Songs
Elementary Readers
Films: Dramatic and Documentary
Films: Language Study
Filmstrips and Slides
Integrated Programs
Linguistics
Literary Texts
Maps
Periodicals
Pictures and Wall Charts
Reference Grammars
Review Grammars
Supplementary Materials
Teachers Course Guides

MINOR REMODELING

Installation of a language laboratory or of electronic language teaching equipment in a classroom, establishment of an audio-visual library, or installation of test-grading equipment often requires some remodeling of a school building. Minor remodeling necessary to make effective use of specialized equipment in accordance with the purposes of the Act is eligible for support. During the period 1959-63, there were 2,713 minor remodeling projects related to foreign-language classrooms and laboratory units.

THE SCOPE OF TITLE III LANGUAGE SUPPORT

During the first five years of NDEA, there were more than 27,000 state projects for the acquisition of equipment and materials in the field of modern foreign languages and for related minor remodeling. NDEA provision for language supervisors made its contribution to the selection of appropriate equipment and materials and to the competence of teachers to use them. In so far as the quality of instruction depends on the availability of appropriate materials and equipment, and surely this is second only to able teachers, the program has presented the states and their schools with new opportunities—and with new problems and responsibilities. "The Office of Education and the respective State educational agencies are accountable and responsible to the Congress for the efficiency and the integrity of the operation of this program in the interests of the objectives set forth in the Act. In the discharge of that accountability, it is necessary to depend upon the leadership, integrity, and prudent judgment of teachers, supervisors who are specialists in the three subject areas, administrators, and other officials in the local, State, and Federal educational agencies."[84]

---

[84] *NDEA Title III Guidelines*, Introduction, p. vi.

VIII

MLA FLP & NDEA

When the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association was five years old, in 1957, the Association drew up a five-year plan for strengthening modern foreign languages in American education and prepared a request for a foundation grant of more than five million dollars to implement it.[1] The proposal outlined five major areas of effort designed:

1. to increase the quantity of language study in the United States; i.e., "to persuade more people to study foreign languages—and more *different* languages . . . for a long enough time to acquire functional proficiency."
2. to enhance the quality of language instruction, by means of a "coordinated campaign, involving all language organizations (local, state, regional, national) to improve and modernize foreign language instruction at all levels."
3. to increase the variety of language study in the United States by "intensive promotion of a nationally coordinated development of instruction in both the 'unusual languages' and the teaching of English as a foreign language, by the extension and improvement of current programs, the creation of new programs, and a system of scholarships."
4. to encourage more research in language learning by "establishment of coordinated programs for cooperative research and experimentation in various aspects of language learning and for development of new tests, materials, and techniques."
5. to encourage the spread of the program's influence by "creation of intensive *pilot programs* in selected States in an effort to apply the best professional thinking about language instruction, articulation, and cooperation among local and state agencies concerned in any way with effective language teaching."

The proposal called for establishment by the MLA of a "strong central bureau" to act as the program's coordinating and administrative agency.

---

[1] "A Five-Year Program for Improving Modern Foreign Language Instruction in the National Interest," mimeographed (New York: MLA, 1957).

To encourage increased language study, the FL Program would continue publicity to persuade educators, parents, and the general public of the value of language education and of the necessity for sequences of language study that could result in real proficiency in the spoken and written language. But in addition to an "information and advisory campaign," the MLA proposed programs to *demonstrate* effective language sequences and to develop new teaching materials appropriate to different age groups.

The MLA was concerned both with raising the effectiveness of the present corps of teachers and with improving the education of future teachers. It proposed to develop tests to measure the abilities of teachers in the seven areas of competence that had been identified in an FL Program Policy Statement: aural understanding, speaking, reading, writing, language analysis, culture, and professional preparation. It proposed to develop such tests in French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish, and English as a second language. It planned to promote the use of these tests in the certification and employment of language teachers not only by persuading state departments of education and colleges and universities training teachers to use them but also by using them as guides in all the teacher-training and refresher programs and demonstrations included in its own overall plan.

Almost the entire MLA proposal was for action and demonstration programs, not merely for propaganda. Three institutes at three different colleges or universities were planned for in-service teachers. Fifty promising in-service teachers were to be sent each year to Master of Arts in Language Teaching programs at universities which would be approved in terms of the quality of their programs. Fifty annual grants would enable promising in-service teachers to study in the country of their language. Teaching materials for intensive introductory courses in several "unusual" languages (manuals, phonograph records, and the like) were to be commissioned. Intensive courses in one or two unusual languages (Chinese and Arabic were proposed) were to be given for teachers of the common languages, first to demonstrate new teaching procedures and second to establish a reservoir of "linguistically inclined people" with at least a beginning acquaintance with an unusual language.

Two things in particular were expected to lead to improvement in the education of future teachers. The tests to be developed for certification purposes were expected to influence the curriculum

ŋ

for future teachers. A four-year program designed to produce graduates who would meet the requirements of the FL Program's authorized "Statement of Qualifications" for teachers was to be demonstrated.

The establishment or encouragement of *demonstration* centers was central to almost every major activity of the proposed program:

> In order to encourage the most effective practices in language instruction it is essential that model demonstration programs be created. Each such program will be a center for research and experimentation in the special problem of the program. A variety of such model programs must be developed. Examples are: a full sequence of instruction in one language, grade III through XII; a six-year high-school course in each of the following—Russian, French, Spanish, German, Italian; a language laboratory effectively integrated into a high-school language course; a language laboratory effectively integrated into a college language course; a four-year teacher-training course . . . ; a college-credit television program in at least one language . . . ; a two-year course in one language for adult education students; an in-service refresher course; a Master-of-Arts-in-Language-Teaching course for liberal arts graduates; a short-term intensive course in some uncommon language (e.g., Chinese, Arabic) designed for adult professional people; an M.A. program for teachers of English as a foreign language; etc. In some cases an existing venture somewhere in the country will need only adequate stimulation, assistance, and direction to be developed into a model demonstration; but in some cases the desired programs will have to be initiated.

All told, the proposal anticipated some fifteen demonstration centers dealing with fifteen different aspects of language education. The plan allocated an imaginary $1,500,000 for the demonstration centers. The new MLA bureau was to plan the variety of programs needed, identify existing programs that might be brought into the project, and locate new programs. It was to "organize, out of the total national scene, the specialized personnel who can most effectively advise and evaluate each of the continuing programs, and to promote imitation of the effective practices in effect in these programs." The time scheme allowed a year for planning, another year for the activation of most or all of the demonstration centers, and three years for their further development and for intensifying programs of publicity about them. There were plans for detailed pamphlets about each program, plans to encourage individual and group visits to them, and plans for professionally-made motion pictures which could take the demonstrations to any interested audience.

The plan also envisaged state-wide pilot programs in a few states –three, four, or five. Financial support was proposed for each state selected to provide a staff consisting of a director, who was to be a leading member of the language profession in the state, an associate director from the state department of education, an assistant director, and appropriate secretarial assistance. All of the informational resources of the MLA central bureau were to be channeled (in the selected states) through these pilot programs. At the conclusion of the state pilot program, it was proposed to give each state not in the pilot program funds to pay the salary of a "language advisor" for a year. Again there was a timetable. It provided two years for preliminary planning, for negotiation with particular states, for the selection of personnel, two years for the operation of the pilot programs, and a year for the support of the language-advisory program in other states.

The entire program was to be administered by a professional staff of "five full-time high caliber persons, respected in the language profession and of proven ability in one or more of the following: administration, teaching, linguistics, or research." These people were to be MLA employees. In typical MLA fashion, the bureau was to work with "appropriate advisors, consultants, and conferences." In addition to planning, coordinating, directing, and evaluating all of the project activities, this staff was to provide a clearinghouse of information about language education. It was to prepare and distribute a considerable variety of publications and establish liaison with professional associations in a variety of fields and with the federal government, which was described as "demonstrating increasing interest in language study in American education."

The request for foundation support for this program was accompanied by a separate proposal for the establishment of a Center for Applied Linguistics–the only part of the program which received foundation support. It is a thriving institution, which has had continuing foundation support and many NDEA research contracts. In the projected MLA program, the Center for Applied Linguistics was to be particularly important as a means of multiplying and strengthening instructional programs in unusual languages and in English as a second language. These are among the areas in which it has made significant contributions.

The proposal emphasized the fact that an educational reform takes time. "*Regardless of financial resources,* it will take five to ten years to train effective personnel, establish effective programs, develop effective materials, influence school and college administrations, and change public opinion."

The MLA did not think of its request as modest. For the five-year program, exclusive of the proposed Center for Applied Linguistics, it requested $5,425,000.

Although the MLA failed to secure foundation support for its proposed program, it has been given credit for a much greater success—it has been given credit for the special emphasis given to modern foreign languages in NDEA. The Commissioner of Education affirmed that

> The Modern Language Association had a good deal to do—sometimes indirectly, sometimes directly—with the introduction of the Language Title into the new Act and with its favorable reception by Congress. And there is no doubt that your Foreign Language Program, inaugurated in 1952, played an important part—even though it cannot be a measured part—in calling the attention of the American public to the unhappy facts about the language situation in this country, and to the growing importance of the study of foreign languages in this competitive and fast-changing world.[2]

John R. Ludington, also of the USOE, probably did exaggerate a little when he said "It is no exaggeration to say that without the Modern Language Association there may never have been an NDEA,"[3] but he said it.

The MLA's five-year plan reflected the experience of five years of the MLA FL Program. The same thinking and experience, as Commissioner Derthick's statement testifies, underlay many of the modern language provisions of the NDEA. Parker's book, *The National Interest and Foreign Languages*, of course reflected the same thinking and experience: he had been Executive Secretary of the MLA and was founder and director of its Foreign Language Program. That book, with reference to NDEA provisions for language study, Derthick called "the legislator's Bible."[4]

The same thinking is reflected in much of the administration of the Act, as well as in its formulation. Parker and Mildenberger, both of whom had been directors of the MLA FL Program, were the first two administrators of the NDEA Language Development

---

[2] Lawrence G. Derthick, "The Purpose and Legislative History of the Foreign Language Titles in the National Defense Education Act, 1958," *PMLA*, LXXIV (May 1959), 48.

[3] "The Foreign Language Program in Title III of the National Defense Education Act," *PMLA*, LXXV (May 1960), 11.

[4] Derthick, p. 48.

Program, during the early days of administrative policy making. "I can recall now no policy decision," Parker told a conference of English professors in 1961, "made by either of us that did not reflect, conscientiously and confidently, the findings of the FL Program's Steering Committee or of some conference of experts that we had called and later reported on."

It is not surprising, then, that there should be NDEA provisions for support of institutes for language teachers, fellowships for language students (particularly in the neglected languages), stipends for teachers to attend institutes, provisions for research in language learning, for the development of new teaching materials, for surveys and studies of the state of language education, for the establishment of language and area centers, and for employment by states of state supervisors of language education. It is not surprising that administrative decisions should have provided contracts for the development of tests in the seven areas of competence defined for teachers, that language and area centers should have been restricted to neglected languages, that audio-lingual teaching should be encouraged, that state publications should have been supported. It is not surprising that NDEA provisions should overlook the need for improvement in the graduate programs of prospective college teachers of the common languages. So did the MLA.

But there are differences as well as likenesses. The first difference is in the location of responsibility. The MLA asked for a five million dollar program to be administered by itself. The proposal was drafted by leaders of the profession. It was to be an extension of the FL Program, which leaders of the profession had planned, initiated, and administered and which had begun a new unification of the profession. The new program was also to be administered by leaders of the profession, through the one organization of language scholars and teachers which welcomes as members scholars and teachers of any modern language.[5] The program which came into being, on the other hand, has of course been administered by the government, although some of the key people were the same. It made a difference.

---

[5] The MLA does include among its members teachers of many languages. Its membership includes very few teachers from elementary and secondary schools, however. People from the universities dominate its thinking even about the lower schools.

"The role of the private sector," Mildenberger said at Middlebury College, after five years of NDEA,

> as distinct from the Government, has undergone a rather remarkable and ironic reversal of roles in the language field . . .
>
> The very magnitude of the federal effort in the last five years carried with it a spectre which we in Washington constantly eye uneasily . . .
>
> What we fear is that the private sector of your profession, out of awe and satisfaction, will be uncritical and will, by silence, desert its proper role of policy leadership.
>
> In various immediate ways, we in Washington can seek to forestall this surrender of authority. We have an advisory committee of eminent scholars and educational administrators to advise the Commissioner of Education on language matters. We use consultant panels of your peers to review and rate applications and proposals. Our language programs in the Office of Education are staffed by people who are close to the language classroom, and we have a healthy turnover of such staff people . . .
>
> But what has bothered me for the past few years is the immense stillness of the profession. It would seem as though the Modern Language Association Foreign Language Program of the Nineteen Fifties had settled all the questions of the language field, and now it remains only for Government funds to implement FL Program policies and American education will be fully served.[6]

It is indeed fortunate that the administration of the USOE language programs has been largely in the hands of people "close to the language classroom." In his discussion of *AID and the Universities,* John Gardner uses the NDEA language and area centers as an example of government programs which respect the autonomy of universities and enjoy good relations with them.[7] But his discussion of some of the difficulties in the administration of AID is not irrelevant to some of the problems of NDEA administration. The USOE is understaffed. It has not had authorization for the staff it needs and cannot always fill the positions that have been authorized. Mildenberger speaks of a "healthy turnover," but this is also an optimist's way of saying that the USOE cannot attract and hold all of the highly qualified personnel it needs. "If collaboration is to be successful," Gardner observes, "the Federal agency involved must have a nucleus of first-class people capable of dealing with outside individuals and institutions on terms of professional equality."[8] There is and has been a nucleus of such people in the NDEA administration, but not enough of them. They have been hard to find and hard to keep. During his seven months as director of the Language Development Program, Parker reports, he offered "administrative posts to nineteen carefully chosen persons" who refused them, and he left the office "with three bureaucratic blots on my escutcheon, for there were three important positions on my staff still unfilled . . . I had not spent the money available."

---

[6] Kenneth W. Mildenberger, in an address at Middlebury College, 13 August 1963.

[7] John W. Gardner, *AID and the Universities* (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964), p. 14.

It is not salary alone that makes school and college people decline positions in government, but only the most zealous will accept cuts in pay for the joys of a bureaucracy. Parker's account surely justifies repetition of the recommendation made previously that the Congress give the USOE the financial resources it needs for staff adequate in numbers and competence.

The second difference between the MLA proposal and the NDEA program is in size. A five-year program to be financed by five and a half million dollars could not be a national program in the same way that a program with 135 million to spend in five years could be. The MLA proposal envisaged three summer institutes annually, fifty annual fellowships for in-service teachers, fifty for prospective teachers, and fifty annual grants for foreign travel for in-service teachers. It proposed production of teaching materials in "several" unusual languages, a single demonstration center for a language sequence, grades III through XII, a single demonstration high school program in each of five languages, a single demonstration of the use of the language laboratory in high school, one in college, state services in from three to five states, and no acquisition program except as schools learned the need for new equipment and materials and procured them for themselves. NDEA in contrast, during its first five years, provided support for 300 institutes, awarded 3,450 Title VI fellowships for the study of neglected languages, in addition to Title IV fellowships for the study of common or uncommon languages, supported 55 language and area centers which taught 70 different neglected languages during the first five years, provided loan funds for uncounted students of languages, helped any state that wanted language supervisors to provide them, supported the development of teaching ma-

[8] Ibid., p. 2. Gardner adds that "The notion that a Federal agency can let its direct-hire staff deteriorate and get all of its talent on contract is a dangerous delusion."

terials in 120 languages, and through the states gave support of various kinds to any school system that wanted to develop longer sequences of language study or otherwise to expand or strengthen its program.[*]

There are differences other than size, which are partly a function of size. The MLA plan stressed quality more than immediate quantity. Its chief emphasis was on discovering and demonstrating better ways of conducting language education. NDEA has supported the development of better ways of teaching languages, but it has also put great stress on the immediate multiplication and expansion of programs employing our present knowledge—on quick quantity. Although it has provided some means of exchange of experience, it has supported no formal demonstration programs.

The MLA plan was a five-year plan which assumed the availability of funds and which budgeted for the whole period. NDEA has lasted more than five years, but it has been handicapped by dependence on annual appropriations (which cannot be anticipated) and by the requirement that funds be expended (or at least committed) within each fiscal year or be "lost"—i.e., returned to the treasury. Long-range planning is difficult for everybody.

The MLA plan, for several of its chief projected activities, proposed planning and "tooling" periods of a year or more, in order to make the most of limited resources. Much larger resources should have demanded even more initial planning, but there has never been time. More than once the USOE problem has been how to make wise commitments of funds available, particularly at

[*]

MLA Plan	*NDEA Five-Year Achievement*
Expenditure: $5,425,000	$135,000,000
Institutes: 15 for 900 teachers	300 for 15,600 teachers
Fellowships for secondary school teachers: 500	0
Fellowships for potential college teachers: 0	3,450 (Title VI)
Grants for foreign travel for in-service teachers: 250	0
Contract teaching materials for uncommon languages: "several"	120
Language and area centers established: 0	55
Tests: 7 areas for 6 languages	7 areas for 5 languages
State supervisory services, 3 states for 2 years, 47 states for 1 year	38 states
Demonstration centers: 15	0

the beginning of the program. Parker, for example, recalling his experience as first director of the NDEA Language Development Program, speaks of "the fearful responsibility of spending $4,200,000 in the course of only twenty-nine working days." There is a great difference between long-range planning for the wise expenditure of limited resources and hasty planning for wise expenditure of unanticipated large sums.

NDEA deadlines have not given the USOE the time needed for planning, and planning done by the profession has too often been piecemeal. Schools and colleges, teachers, professors, language supervisors, school and state administrators, and learned society executives have thought about the future of language education, but they have sometimes thought as much about ways and means of getting contracts and grants. The MLA FL Program Advisory and Liaison Committee has issued only one policy statement since the enactment of NDEA in 1958, and that was a reaffirmation of an earlier one. No wonder Mildenberger speaks of the silence of the profession. It has, to be sure, been a golden silence.

NDEA activities in the field of language education have been of two kinds, although the Act does not distinguish them in these terms: first, the long-range activities of the kind stressed in the MLA plan of 1957; second, a "crash" program in a period of educational emergency. The first group of activities includes the Research Program, the Fellowship Program, the Language and Area Centers Program. The Institutes and Title III acquisitions and remodelings illustrate the crash program.

In the third edition of *The National Interest and Foreign Languages*, "the legislator's Bible," Parker discusses the priorities:

> Correcting an imbalance requires *time*, as does language study itself. It is not to be accomplished by any "crash" program, no matter what funds are made available . . . Thus, the Title VI institute program should not, in a burst of enthusiasm, be expanded too rapidly, whereas the fellowship program—the producer of qualified personnel for the future—should be greatly expanded, and should explicitly designate *undergraduates*, in addition to graduate students, as recipients of fellowships. Mastery of difficult languages like Chinese and Arabic is no task for a year or two of post-baccalaureate work crowded with other concerns . . .
>
> If, hereafter, economy requires the reduction of support to anything in the present Title VI, the cut should never be made in the fellowships program or the research program. It is in these that we do more than struggle to remedy a presently bad situation: it is in these that we assure ourselves of a more hopeful future.[10]

---

[10] Parker, pp. 16-17.

Elsewhere in the volume, Parker implies a high priority on the language and area centers.[11]

The MLA plan minimized the crash program. Because it anticipated limited resources, it established different priorities. And those priorities may tell us something of what leaders in the modern language profession would advise as NDEA priorities when they are thinking of the best use of money, not of the best way to get it. Research, fellowships, language and area centers, and demonstration programs should have the highest priority.

Given advancing knowledge of language and of language learning, a continuing and increasing supply of well-trained language scholars and teachers, growing and improving resources for the education of teachers, and continuing demonstrations of effective teaching methods and materials, old and new, we need have little fear for the future of language education. If we may take it on faith that future teachers will be better educated than past ones, there will be little need for remedial institutes. (But there must be good works as well as faith. Neither the MLA plan nor the NDEA program puts enough stress on improvement of the graduate programs that produce future teachers and teachers of teachers.) Schools the country over, equipped with electronic teaching devices and provided with appropriate materials, may or may not need federal support for maintenance and replacement. They will surely seek it. The cost will be less than for the initial acquisition and accompanying remodeling. But the need to advance our knowledge, to improve the education of our teachers, and to assure a continuing supply of teachers will not diminish.

Departure from these priorities is not in any sense a "fault" of the Act or of its administration. The Act provided for a crash program to correct a present imbalance and a long-range program to assure "a more hopeful future." The USOE was given a crash program to administer and a long-range program (without the assurance of long-range financing), and its officers have undertaken both. The distinction between the two kinds of programs has not been clearly drawn, but it is important and should be kept in mind by the Congress, the USOE, and the profession.

---

[11] P. 148. "A job of educational planning on a national scale is called for, and is now actually begun, thanks to NDEA. The intelligent solution is surely no widespread and indiscriminate introduction of courses in the unusual languages (Bengali at West Teacup Teachers College) but rather . . . the careful establishment of centers of instruction in colleges and universities in various parts of our country, each one specializing not only in a group of related languages but also in the geography, history, economics, literature, religion, and politics of the countries involved."

The NDEA program has not always exemplified the priorities that the profession would recommend. Under pressure to spend (or lose) large sums of money, some parts of the program have grown faster than the capacity of the profession immediately to make the most of them. But Mildenberger has reminded us of the "immense stillness" of the profession, and Parker has reminded us that the profession has taken the money. It is not the USOE that spent 135 millions in five years on language education and it is not the USOE which is spending currently available funds. The spenders are the schools and colleges and state offices of education to which the USOE makes funds available. In those schools and colleges and state offices, for the most part, those responsible for spending the money for language education have been language teachers. The profession has had the central responsibility and will continue to have it.

Parker and Mildenberger remind us that money does not spend itself wisely; it is wisely spent by wise and knowledgeable people. The warning is pertinent, but it should not lead us to think that the modern language teaching profession has since NDEA devoted itself exclusively to getting and spending, laying waste its powers. It has also been concerned for the future of language education. When the money became available, spending it wisely in the context of unrealistic deadlines was an immediate problem for the USOE and for those with whom it works in the partnership of American education. It is an immediate problem for the professional leadership of the disciplines that have newly been made eligible for NDEA support. In spite of the difficulties inherent in size and haste, however, the achievement has been great. There has been a good beginning of a revolution in language education. It has been accomplished by the language teaching profession with the assistance of federal funds.

In a healthy educational enterprise there are likely to be cycles of appraisal, action, and change, reappraisal, new action. The MLA FL Program began as an appraisal of the situation in language education in this country. It was also an action program, in which a large part of the language teaching profession joined. Not alone, but as an important part of a complex of other influences, it culminated in the specification of modern foreign languages as eligible for special support under NDEA. Opportunities for action were multiplied, the action accelerated. The period of action continues, but another time has come for reappraisal.

There remain plenty of issues on which policy leadership is needed. There are problems to be solved, questions to be answered, decisions to be made. Even the questions that seem to have been answered are really open questions, on which the American people, their government, their school systems, and the educational world generally must continue the dialogue of the past few years. Members of the language teaching profession have expertness and wisdom and a stake in the discussion. They must take a responsible part in it.

Appendix 1

National Defense Education Act of 1958, as Amended in 1964

Title I	***General Provisions:*** **Declaration of policy and definitions**
Title II	***Student loans:*** **Establishes loan funds at institutions of higher education**
Title III	***Financial assistance for strengthening instruction in Science, Mathematics, Modern Foreign Languages, and other critical subjects:*** **Provides for: (1) implementation of State plans, involving: (a) State supervisory or related services in public elementary and secondary schools, and (b) acquisition of materials and equipment and minor remodeling to accommodate such equipment** **(2) loans to non-profit private schools**
Title IV	***National Defense Fellowships:*** **Provides for fellowships to graduate students, a number of whom (in 1965, at least 1500; thereafter, at least one third of the total) must study in new or expanded programs. The recipients must be interested in teaching in institutions of higher education, and must be pursuing or intending to pursue a course of study leading to a Ph.D. or the equivalent. The Title also provides for aid to universities for such fellows.**

Title V	*Guidance, Counseling, and Testing:* Provides for: Part A implementation of State programs of testing, counseling and guidance in public elementary and secondary schools and in public junior colleges and technical institutes, and Part B Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes
Title VI	*Language Development:* Provides for: (1) Language and Area Centers (2) National Defense Foreign Language Fellowships (3) Research and Studies
Title VII	*Utilization of Television, Radio, Motion Pictures, and Related Media for Educational Purposes:* Provides for: Part A research and experimentation Part B dissemination of information Part C Advisory Committee
Title VIII	*Area Vocational Education Program:* Amends the Vocational Education Act of 1946
Title IX	*Science Information Service*
Title X	*Miscellaneous provisions:* Administration, etc.; Section 1004 provides for the keeping of records and accounts by the State Education Agencies which submit plans under one of the Titles of the Act; Section 1009 provides for improvement of statistical services of State Education Agencies.
Title XI	*Institutes:* Provides for institutes in history, geography, modern foreign languages, reading and English. The institutes are open primarily to teachers of these subjects, teachers of disadvantaged youth, library personnel, and educational media specialists.

Appendix 2

How This Study Was Written

When the Modern Language Association's Foreign Language Program was five years old, the Advisory Committee planned a much expanded action program for the improvement and spread of language education in the United States. The plan, which is described in Chapter VIII of this report, was contingent on foundation support which was not forthcoming. But it was in a way an appraisal of what had been accomplished and of what needed to be done. A year later, NDEA support for language education made foundation support for much of the MLA proposal seem unnecessay; far larger sums were available to help the profession undertake what it thought desirable.

When NDEA was five years old, the MLA FL Program Advisory Committee again thought that a time for appraisal was at hand. The Committee decided to undertake a review of what had happened in language education during the period of NDEA support and to take a look at the future. The Committee drew up a plan for such a review and sought and received support for it from the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

The Carnegie Corporation and the MLA committee decided that the report should not be a committee report but that of an individual. They also decided that its author should not be a member of the foreign language teaching profession. The director of the study (i.e., the writer of the report) was invited to undertake it partly because he was not and never has been a teacher of foreign languages. He could bring to the task all the advantages of ignorance.

The committee, which served as an advisory committee, could bring all the advantages of varied experience and expertness in modern language scholarship and teaching. It added other expertness by co-opting two members for the duration of the project:

Chester D. Babcock, Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum and Instruction, State Department of Education, Olympia, Washington, and Malcolm D. Talbott, Associate Dean, Rutgers Law School.

The staff of the study consisted of the director, John S. Diekhoff, for six months, a graduate assistant, John Joseph Adams, now a graduate student at Columbia University, for three months, and Mrs. Jean Martin, of the MLA FL Program, who provided expert secretarial and administrative assistance, on top of her other duties at the MLA.

With an official staff of one person for six months, a second person for three months, and one person with part-time secretarial and administrative duties, it was clear that no personal survey of a great many NDEA projects was possible, that no new statistical studies could be undertaken, and that no elaborate questionnaires could be circulated or analyzed. Instead, the report has depended on the written record of a much studied program and upon the advice and assistance of many people who have been involved in various NDEA activites. USOE and MLA files were opened and USOE and MLA personnel have patiently allowed interruption of their busy lives for interviews, for meetings, and to read and comment on draft reports and memoranda. So have others—state supervisors of language education, professors of modern foreign languages in colleges and universities, teachers of modern languages in the lower schools, a congressman.

On the basis of conversations with such people and on the basis of the published record and of unpublished reams in the USOE and MLA files, the director of the study drafted memoranda on the several NDEA language activities, memoranda which have become sections of the report. Each section of the report was discussed in detail by the augmented Advisory Committee, which convened in New York five times for two-day meetings.[1] During the first day of each such meeting, the committee was joined by colleagues with special expertness in the topics under discussion. When the language and area centers were being discussed, for example, the chief of the Centers Section, USOE, was present and there was also the director of an important NDEA-supported center. When the institutes were under discussion, there was similar representation from the USOE and from the universities. For each topic there were experts from the USOE and from the field.

---

[1] 18 and 19 September 1964; 9 and 10 October 1964; 6 November 1964; 11 and 12 December 1964; 19 and 20 March 1965.

During the second day of each committee session, the committee met without outside consultants.

A fifth meeting of the committee was held on 19 and 20 March 1965 to review the completed report.

Each of the several drafts of the report has been read and commented on by members of the committee and the several sections by the appropriate consulting experts. Every recommendation has been discussed in committee. The object was not consensus, but a good deal of consensus emerged. There is no recommendation in the report which represents the opinion of the director alone and most of the recommendations—three-fourths, at least—have the unanimous concurrence of the augmented Advisory Committee.

The members of the Advisory Committee for the purposes of this study were: Chester D. Babcock of the Washington State Department of Education, Mildred V. Boyer, Department of Romance Languages, University of Texas, Ruth J. Dean, Department of French, Mount Holyoke College, Albert H. Marckwardt, Department of English, Princeton University, William R. Parker, Department of English, Indiana University, Jack M. Stein, Department of German, Harvard University, Malcolm D. Talbot of the Rutgers University Law School, Leon I. Twarog, Department of Slavic Languages, Ohio State University, and W. Freeman Twaddell, Departments of German and Linguistics, Brown University.

The consultants to the Committee who met with it on one or more occasions were: Donald N. Bigelow, Chief, Language and Area Centers Section, Division of College and University Assistance, U. S. Office of Education; James H. Blessing, Assistant Director, Graduate Fellowship Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, U. S. Office of Education; John B. Carroll, Department of Education, Harvard University; John A. Cookson, Chief, Language Fellowship Section, Division of College and University Assistance, U. S. Office of Education; William B. Edgerton, Director, Slavic Language and Area Center, Indiana University; Charles A. Ferguson, Director (on leave), Center for Applied Linguistics; A. Bruce Gaarder, Specialist, Foreign Languages, Instructional Resources Branch, Title III NDEA, Division of State Grants, U. S. Office of Education; D. Lee Hamilton, Director, Language Development Branch, Division of College and University Assistance, U. S. Office of Education; Alfred S. Hayes, Education and Research Programs, Center for Applied Linguistics;

Marjorie C. Johnston, Title III Director, Instructional Resources Branch, Division of State Grants, U. S. Office of Education; Martin Joos, Acting Director, Center for Applied Linguistics; Tora T. Ladu, Supervisor, Modern Foreign Languages, North Carolina State Department of Education; Lyman H. Legters, Specialist, Language and Area Centers Section, Division of College and University Assistance, U. S. Office of Education; John Lotz, Director, Uralic-Altaic Language and Area Center, Columbia University; Kenneth W. Mildenberger, Director, Division of College and University Assistance, Bureau of Educational Assistance Programs, U. S. Office of Education; Howard Lee Nostrand, Department of Romance Languages, University of Washington; Lawrence Poston, Jr., Department of Modern Languages, University of Oklahoma, and former Chief of the Language Institute Section, U. S. Office of Education; Gordon N. Ray, President, John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation; Allan F. Rosebrock, Director, Teacher Education and Certification, New Jersey State Department of Education; James M. Spillane, Chief, Language Institute Section, Division of College and University Assistance, U. S. Office of Education; Wilmarth H. Starr, Department of Romance Languages, New York University, Consultant and Project Director, MLA Testing Program; Bernard Weinberg, Department of Romance Languages and Literatures, University of Chicago; Irving R. Wershow, Chief, Language Research Section, Division of College and University Assistance, U. S. Office of Education.

From the Modern Language Association: George L. Anderson, Associate Executive Secretary and Treasurer; Joseph G. Astman, Director, MLA Testing Program, John H. Fisher, Executive Secretary, John T. Harmon, Director, Materials Center, André Paquette, Director, Teacher Preparation Program, Donald D. Walsh, Associate Executive Secretary and Director, Foreign Language Program.

From the Carnegie Corporation of New York: Peter Caws.

Summary of Achievements under NDEA

Some very significant changes in language education have resulted wholly or in part from the National Defense Education Act:

Many more elementary schools, junior high schools, high schools, and junior colleges teach courses in modern foreign languages than did in 1958. Many more students are enrolling in them.

Many schools and school systems have extended the sequence of language instruction; i.e., they provide more years of instruction in the languages they teach, aiming at greater proficiency.

Many schools have introduced instruction in second and third foreign languages—or more.

Instruction in some formerly neglected languages has been introduced into a few elementary and secondary schools.

Many schools and school systems have reexamined their language programs and improved their quality.

The objectives of language study are being redefined and broadened. New methods to achieve these broadened objectives are being developed and refined.

Thousands of elementary and secondary school teachers of foreign languages have enhanced their language skills and their pedagogical skills by attending NDEA-supported institutes.

Modern electro-mechanical teaching equipment has been installed in thousands of schools.

New texts and other teaching materials have been developed and made available in some of the common languages. These new materials have been introduced into thousands of schools.

Many school libraries have increased their foreign language collections.

Many schools and school systems have been helped to establish audio-visual libraries.

Professional language supervisors have been added to the staffs of most state offices of education to provide leadership and consultation and to stimulate in-service training programs for language teachers.

The competence desired in modern foreign language teachers has been defined, and standardized tests to measure that competence have been developed for the common languages.

With these tests it is possible to base certification of language teachers in part upon defined and measured competence rather than merely upon accumulated credits. Several states and many colleges and universities already use these tests in screening potential teachers for certification.

New standardized tests are also available for the measurement of student progress and for placement of students. These tests, available for pre- and post-testing, are an important new tool of educational research.

Many colleges and universities have restored or increased language requirements for admission or graduation.

High school graduates better prepared in foreign languages have reached the colleges and have enabled them to put more emphasis upon advanced study of the common foreign languages and upon the study of literature.

Study of previously neglected languages has been supported in the universities. Language and area centers for the study of critical and neglected languages have been introduced in some and strengthened in other universities. The study of unusual languages has been greatly stimulated.

New Ph.D. programs in foreign languages have been established in some universities; in others, programs have been extended and strengthened.

Materials for the study of many less commonly taught languages have been made available for the first time.

For the first time there are people in the United States known to have studied certain previously neglected languages and the areas in which they are spoken. A fellowship program has greatly increased their numbers. There is a roster of such people.

The supply of teachers of modern foreign languages has been increased, at all school levels.

There has been a significant gain in our knowledge of what is happening in language education, and there have been significant studies of national needs for language competence and of its availability in the population.

Significant research has increased our knowledge of languages, of language teaching, of the psychology of language learning, and related subjects.

Language study has become more highly respected in American education and among the American public. The myth that Americans cannot be good linguists has been exploded.

Appendix 4

Summary of Recommendations

I. *Goals and Curriculum*

a. The profession should establish reasonable goals of language study for students of different ages and for different sequences of language study. It should provide guidance in planning the educational program not in ideal but in practical terms (pp. 17-24).

b. When a language program is initiated, it should be with the expectation of developing it into a sequence that can result in a reasonable language competence. Without that expectation, it should not be initiated (p. 24).

c. A school system with a language program should make language instruction available to its students until they graduate, at whatever point it begins. Early beginnings should not be matched by early endings. Every sequence should continue through grade 12 (p. 23).

d. The same warnings against faddishness with reference to FLES programs apply with reference to the introduction of exotic languages in secondary schools (p. 26).

e. The language program should be planned from the top down. It is folly to begin a FLES program that will be discontinued in junior high school. It is unwise to introduce into a school instruction in a second FL before a full sequence (at least four years) is established in the first FL (p. 23).

f. There is need for continuing conferences and other means of communication among language teachers at various school levels. Some such conferences should from time to time address themselves to the coordination of language programs at the several school levels (pp. 24-25).

g. Well-planned sequential programs of language instruction beginning at different ages and grade levels are needed, as are appropriate materials for them (p. 25).

h. Courses in which the freshman continues collegiate study in an FL in which he has fairly advanced skills should be reexamined (pp. 24-25).

i. College courses for students beginning their second or third FL should not be the same as for students beginning their first FL (p. 25).

j. There is need for further research on supplementing the study of literature with the study of other aspects of culture (pp. 31-32).

k. If the FL and education faculties of an institution or a group of such faculties wish to accomplish curricular reforms, they might well spend a summer month or a whole summer in conference to draft proposals for change to be submitted to their faculty colleagues. NDEA support might be made available for this activity (p. 92).

II. *Teacher Preparation*

a. The MLA should continue its conferences on ways and means of changing present undergraduate and graduate programs so as to improve the education of teachers and teachers of teachers (p. 91).

b. Teams of experts should be designated to visit college and university language departments at their request and to help improve their teacher preparation programs. Foundation or NDEA funds might well be made available to support this activity (p. 92).

c. The USOE should give special support to the language and education programs of a few institutions in different parts of the country so that they may become demonstration centers for their regions. Funds should be made available to enable faculty of neighboring institutions to visit a demonstration center (p. 91).

d. If children whose native language is not English are to have an education that fits their needs, some teacher-training institutions must introduce special programs designed for future teachers of these children. Special materials must be developed for these programs (p. 97).

e. Institutions engaged in the education of modern language teachers should base their recommendations for certification on recently tested proficiency in addition to or instead of counted credits. Professional associations of modern language teachers should continue to recommend this practice (p. 45).

f. USOE support of the testing program should be continued, so that present tests may be improved, so that alternate forms may be developed, and so that other tests may be developed when they are needed (p. 45).

g. Provisions should be made in the NDEA for grants in aid and loans to school and college modern foreign language teachers and graduate students who intend to teach modern foreign languages and who submit approved plans for residence or study abroad. Such loans should be forgiveable on the same basis as present NDEA student loans (pp. 66-67).

h. There should be opportunities for teacher exchange and foreign study for scholars, teachers, and graduate students in the languages of Western Europe as well as in the uncommon languages. Further implementation of the Fulbright-Hays Act could provide such opportunities (pp. 67-68).

i. Stress on full utilization of present capacity in colleges and universities and on the quality of the education provided should take priority over the expansion of weaker programs or the encouragement of struggling new ones (p. 57).

j. A follow-up study of what has happened to the early Title IV and VI fellows should be made, as well as continuing study of future fellows, so that we may know their employment experience and the relevance of their study to their occupations (pp. 55 and 66).

k. Provisions should be made for undergraduate fellowships for language study, especially in critical and neglected languages (p. 62).

l. Doctoral programs that can not be completed in four years of study beyond the A.B. by able and industrious full-time students, aided by such special opportunities as the summer workshops, are inexcusable. The USOE can not prescribe the content or the duration of a Ph.D. program, but it can and should limit the fellowships to four years. The obligation to plan reasonable doctoral program rests with the universities (p. 65).

III. *Institutes*

a. The quality of the proposal for an institute and the previous accomplishment of the proposing college or university in the institute program should continue to be the basis for award of contracts (p. 87).

b. The USOE should offer contracts of more than one year to colleges and universities that desire them and that have conducted successful institutes in previous years (pp. 79-80).

c. Any contemplated changes in types of institutes should be made known to the profession as far in advance as possible (pp. 89-90).

d. There is need for NDEA institutes for special FL groups (TV teachers, teachers of English as a second language, teachers whose pupils are not native speakers of English, teachers who are not themselves native speakers of English, FL supervisors), but the shortage of potential staff members for such institutes must be kept in mind (pp. 95-99).

e. The NDEA institutes of all types should continue to have independent and objective evaluation, and other parts of the NDEA language program would benefit from similar independent evaluations (pp. 86-97).

IV. *FL Supervisors*

a. Each state should have a staff of FL supervisors, adequate in number, in calibre, and in salary. Current salaries are inadequate (p. 104).

b. NDEA funds under Title III should be made available for the support of supervisory services not only at the state level but also at the local level (p. 105).

c. A larger proportion of Title III funds should be available for supervisory services (pp. 103-108).

V. *Research*

a. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should seek and the Congress should provide funds adequate to make the USOE what it in part purports to be: a gathering place and clearing house of information about American education (p. 38).

b. The USOE should contract for the periodic evaluation of the several major parts of the Research Program (p. 39).

c. There should be better provisions for publishing and for keeping in print the results of research contracts with the USOE (p. 50).

d. There should be continuing analysis and inventory of our national needs and our human resources in the uncommon languages, of our resources for teaching and learning them, and of the geographic spread of these resources (p. 48).

e. The MLA FL Program should sponsor continuing conferences on needed research in languages and related areas and the modern language profession generally should assume more responsibility for the planning and initiation of research projects (p. 49).

VI. *FLES*

a. Research should be undertaken to find out how products of various FLES programs compare with those who began language study later. There should also be further comparative study of FLES learning by various means: FL specialists, television, grade teachers, and in various combinations (p. 22).

b. A conference should be held to establish guidelines for special institutes for FLES specialists who will be presenting television lessons. Teacher training institutions should provide instruction in the techniques of television teaching for grade teachers and FLES specialists (pp. 95-96).

c. Some existing FLES programs should be designated and supported as demonstration centers, to serve as models for other schools and school systems (p. 21).

VII. *Language Laboratories*

a. No school should install a language laboratory without careful advance planning and without assurance that at least some of its FL teachers are acquainted with and sympathetic to its use. (p. 112).

b. The school system that will not budget for the added cost of operating a language laboratory should not have one (p. 113).

c. The USOE might well undertake to provide or to establish by contract a consulting service for schools contemplating installation of language laboratories with Title III funds (p. 112).

VIII. *Centers*

a. The USOE should reexamine its policy of multiplying centers, but there should always be more than one center for the study of any important area and the language or languages indigenous to it (p. 76).

b. The USOE Research Section should issue contracts for periodic, systematic evaluation of the centers, and the resulting evaluations should be considered in the renewal of contracts for centers (pp. 79-80).

c. Contracts for longer terms would be preferable to the current practice of annual contracts in the centers program (p. 79).

d. Undergraduate study of critical and neglected languages should be supported and encouraged generally (pp. 77-79).

e. There should be some centers for the study of common languages and related areas (p. 80).